

CAI
CC
-77R21

REPORT OF THE
CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON
THE INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY

June 1977

CAI
CC



REPORT OF THE
CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON
THE INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY

June 1977



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114654999>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	v
RECOMMENDATIONS	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xiii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
The Consultative Group	2
II. PROCEDURE	3
Defining 'The Individual, Language & Society' (I.L. & S.)	3
Identifying Individual, Language & Society Scholars	6
Analysis of Questionnaire Data	7
Learned Societies	8
Public Contacts	8
Individual, Language & Society National Planning Symposium	8
III. RESULTS	11
Questionnaires to Scholars	11
Graduate Studies on Individual, Language & Society	26
Individual, Language & Society Research Supported by Canadian Government Departments and Agencies	26
Canada Council Support for Individual, Language & Society Research	29
The National Planning Symposium's View of 'The State of the Art'	30
IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	79
Communication Among Canadian Scholars	80
Cross-Disciplinary Study	84

IV.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS (cont'd)	
	Research Granting Procedures	87
	Canadian Universities and the Individual, Language & Society	90
	Canadian Government Departments and the Individual, Language & Society	93
	REFERENCES	96
	APPENDICES	97
A.	Questionnaire to Scholars	99
B.	Researchers in Individual, Language & Society Study	105
C.	Delegates to the National Planning Symposium on the Individual, Language & Society	109
D.	Format of National Planning Symposium	115
E.	Graduate Studies in Individual, Language & Society	123
F.	Individual, Language & Society Research Supported by Canadian Government Departments and Agencies	129

FOREWORD

Readers may be aware of the Canada Council's Development Program through recent Annual Reports, or through a number of published reports of consultative groups, among them, Ethics, Survey Research and Needs of Scholars in Small Universities. By means of these reports, Council has attempted to serve as a catalyst within the academic community, working with Canadian scholars to consolidate research efforts and to encourage higher quality in scholarship, as well as to heighten awareness of, and to overcome serious difficulties in, various sectors of the research community.

One of Council's first development initiatives was the establishment of a Consultative Group to review Canadian research into the inter-relationships of individual personality, language and society. The reasons for this choice were plain. Canadian scholars were among the world leaders in many of the fields in question, and Council itself had supported a good deal of important work in the area. The issues involved were of critical national significance. And the related research underway in many disciplines seemed to be in need of coordination and integration.

A group of leading scholars from across the country, representing the four disciplines most involved in research into "the individual, language and society", was invited to investigate and report on the state of Canadian research in fields such as ethno-, psycho- and sociolinguistics, covering issues such as language maintenance and language loss, acculturation and deculturation, language and identity, bi- and multi-lingualism. The Group was chaired by a former chairman of Council's Advisory Academic Panel, Wesley H. Coons (Psychology, York University). The members were: Jean Briggs, Sociology and Anthropology, Memorial University; Russell MacArthur, Educational Psychology, University of Alberta; William F. Mackey, Linguistics, Laval University; Donald M. Taylor, Psychology, McGill University; Marc-Adélard Tremblay, Anthropology, Laval University; Frank G. Vallee, Anthropology and Sociology, Carleton University.

The Group decided that their major effort at surveying and evaluating current research should take the form of a conference involving many of the foremost researchers in the area. The proceedings of this conference,

comprising twenty-two specially commissioned papers accompanied by introductions and commentaries for each of eight central themes, have been published by the Canada Council. As an indication of the state of research in Canada, it should interest a wide public. The Report of the Group, it was felt, would be of interest to a more limited readership, hence the format of its presentation.

Readers may be interested in Council's response to a number of recommendations directed to it in this Report.

It is recommended that the Council establish a separate program (or programs) for research in the Individual, Language and Society (recommendations 6, 8, 15, 16). The Canada Council has traditionally refused to give favoured status to any area of research, and does not at present see sufficient reason to change this policy. For many fields of scholarship, not only in the humanities but in the social sciences as well, the Council is the only patron. To redirect funds from these to other areas where there is current interest and usually other sources of support would be counterproductive in the long run and literally disastrous for many Canadian scholars.

The Report recommends in one way or another that the Council become involved in an ongoing way in monitoring and encouraging research in this particular field (recommendations 4, 11, 19). This is the type of activity that Council feels should be carried out by scholars themselves through learned societies and other scholarly associations. The Council already provides the means for engaging in these activities through learned journal and conference grants.

Many of the remaining recommendations of the Consultative Group coincide either with current practices of the Council or with programs recently recommended by other consultative groups, which the Canada Council is transmitting to the newly created Social Sciences and Humanities Council. Thus, recommendations 7, 9 and 10 are already standard practice; while the Consultative Group on the Needs of Scholars in Small Universities has recommended new programs for travel and research workshops which could be used to satisfy the needs expressed in recommendations 14 and 15.

The Council encourages scholars, groups of scholars or learned societies to act along the lines of the recommendations of the consultative groups, and sees such consultative groups as a valuable mechanism for keeping researchers and the Council aware of the development needs of their disciplines.

Frank Milligan
Associate Director
for University Affairs

Consultative Group on the Individual, Language & Society

RECOMMENDATIONS

(supporting arguments will be found on pages indicated in parentheses)

The first 5 recommendations are structural proposals put forward for consideration by Canadian Scholars. Substantive directions for research in the area of the Individual, Language & Society will be found throughout the Report, especially on pp.

It is recommended that:

1. Canadian Scholars in the area of the Individual, Language & Society seek to broaden their knowledge of the research and research techniques of other cognate disciplines. (79, 84-87)
2. Canadian Scholars of the Individual, Language & Society expand their awareness of Canadian research being conducted on their research problems with other subject - populations in different geographic locations, or with different research methods. (79-84)
3. Canadian Scholars take seriously their responsibility for the preparation and publication of study materials (texts, bibliographies, books of readings) for university courses and programmes in the area of the Individual, Language and Society. (92)
4. The Consultative Group on the Individual, Language and Society assume responsibility for establishing a national association of research group, which would encourage membership of anthropologists, linguists, political scientists, psychologists, sociologists and others with relevant interests. (83-84)
5. The new association establish a journal for the publication of scholarly research in the area, by soliciting from the Canada Council, financial aid-to-publication commonly offered to journals of national associations,

with the further understanding that the journal's budget for the first three years will include a substantial amount for its promotion throughout the international, as well as the national, scholarly community. (83-84)

6. Canada Council establish a separate programme which would provide funds for travel and personal support to those scholars in the area of the Individual, Language and Society who wish to acquire knowledge and skills of other cognate disciplines through attendance at interdisciplinary conferences and short institutes and workshops, or through an apprenticeship, of up to a year's duration, in the research programme of a scholar from another discipline. (84-87)
7. A preponderance of the adjudicators of proposals to Canada Council and other granting agencies, for research on the Individual, Language and Society, be actively involved in relevant research on Canadian problems. (87-88)
8. Support for research on the Individual, Language and Society, based on uniquely Canadian situations, be considered in a separate competition, preferably under the umbrella of a Canadian Studies programme. (86-87)
9. Granting agencies encourage sharing of research subjects by investigators who are interested in the same subject population area from different perspectives by
 - a) soliciting the advice of external assessors about the scientific desirability of collaboration;
 - b) informing the prospective researchers of the parallel efforts of their colleagues;
 - c) providing support for planning meetings designed to assess the feasibility of collaborative research and to facilitate the collaboration. (88-90)

10. Granting agencies seek to reduce resistance to research participation in subject populations which are over-exposed to research by:
- a) ensuring that only studies which offer reasonable prospect of providing important data be supported;
 - b) requiring that each grant applicant obtain informed consent from his subjects to participate in the study. (88-90)
11. The proposed organization of Individual, Language and Society Scholars assume responsibility, with the assistance of the Canada Council, for collecting and disseminating information about over-studied groups. (90)
12. Canadian universities develop coordinate multi-disciplinary curricular programmes focussing on Canadian studies of the Individual, Language and Society. (90-92)
13. The Canada Council and other interested bodies provide financial assistance for the preparation and publication of Canadian textbooks, books of readings and bibliographies which would serve as instructional material in university classrooms. (91-92)
14. The Canada Council provide financial support for specialty conferences, modelled on that organized by the Consultative Group on the Individual, Language and Society (C.G.I.L. & S.) in the Fall of 1975, with the proviso that the conference papers be published. (92)
15. The Canada Council assign a portion of its travel budget to inter-university visits by Individual, Language & Society scholars in Canada who are invited to give guest lectures at other Canadian universities and that sponsoring universities investigate the multi-culturalism programme of the Secretary of State as a potential source of funds for inter-university lectureships. (92-93)

16. The Canada Council and other granting agencies provide financial encouragement to Canadian students to pursue studies of the Individual, Language and Society in Canadian universities. (93)
17. Government of Canada departments submit proposals for major data-collecting projects to external review by appropriate university scholars. (93-94)
18. Government of Canada departments facilitate collaboration with university scholars by informing them of proposed large-scale data-collection projects. (94-95)
19. A central bank of assessors' names and fields of competence be established by combining the existing lists of assessors used by all agencies and journals that evaluate studies of the Individual, Language and Society. (94)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work of the Consultative Group has been facilitated greatly by the unstinting efforts of a number of officers of the Canada Council. Initially, they were Alan Armstrong, Luc Jutras and Sheridan Scott, who were followed by Audrey Forster and John McKennirey. All of them have provided diligent and insightful assistance for which we are most grateful. We are indebted too, to Mr. Neil Morrison, Secretary-General of the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board, and Dr. D.G. Cartwright of the Department of Geography, University of Western Ontario, for sharing with us their experience in tabulating and mapping language groups.



INTRODUCTION

Background

Canada contains a wide range of ethnic and racial groups which could provide a natural laboratory for the collection of data vital to the development of a comprehensive understanding of social man. We have our two main language groups as well as large numbers of first, second, and third-generation immigrants from other countries. We have Indians and Eskimos with varying amounts of contact with the predominant cultures ranging from nearly complete acculturation (or deculturation, depending on your starting point) to nearly complete isolation. These population characteristics are replete with near unique opportunities for the study of language acquisition, the consequences for cognitive styles of bi- and multi-language facility, the impact of language and ethnic status on value systems, and the impact on self-concept of minority ethnic status. All of these are areas about which relatively little is known despite the central role they play in social behaviour, particularly in Canadian society in which language is a fundamental dimension of survival of Canada as a nation. While laws concerning language have been passed by several governments in the Country, we lack basic data and basic research, which none of the several government commissions had a mandate to undertake.

Their importance notwithstanding, the scholarly literature indicates that only a small proportion of the research efforts of Canadian scholars has been directed towards these issues. Most of the work that has been done has originated with a few highly productive scholars. And even with these productive scholars, there has been very little interdisciplinary, or even multi-disciplinary, collaboration of the sort which is necessary to enhance

maximally the impact of their research on our understanding of social man: anthropologists tend to work with other anthropologists, linguists with other linguists, psychologists with other psychologists, and sociologists with other sociologists. Yet, the breadth of the problems requires a broad-band research strategy, drawing on the knowledge and techniques of all of these disciplines. Uni-disciplinary research runs the serious risk of producing distorted descriptions of the area, much as the proverbial 3 blind men distorted the shape of the elephant.

The Consultative Group

With these matters in mind the Canada Council, advised by the Development Committee of its Academic Panel, decided to establish a Consultative Group on the Individual, Language and Society (C.G.I.L. & S.). The original terms of reference were outlined as follows:

"Among the areas of concern of this group will be the emotional and cognitive consequences of second language acquisition, bi- and multi-language facility, minority ethnic status, acculturation and deculturation. Initially the group will establish what research in the area has been done by Canadian scholars and who those scholars are. Subsequently, with advice from others who are knowledgeable in the area, gaps in the existing research activities will be identified and proposals made for filling the gaps."

The need for interdisciplinary collaboration was recognized from the outset. Linguistics, anthropology, sociology and psychology were seen to be basic to the area of concern and it was from these disciplines that members of the Consultative Group were selected.

PROCEDURE

Through reviews of the literatures of the relevant disciplines, scholars who were highly productive of significant research were identified and invited to serve as members of the Consultative Group. Members were: Dr. Jean Briggs, Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Memorial University of Newfoundland; Dr. Russell MacArthur, Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta; Dr. William F. Mackey, Professor of Linguistics, Université Laval; Dr. Donald M. Taylor, Professor of Psychology, McGill University; Dr. Marc-Adélard Tremblay, Directeur de l'école des gradués, Université Laval; and Dr. Wesley H. Coons, Professor of Psychology, York University, who served as Chairman. Because of conflicting academic demands, Dr. Briggs resigned in the Fall of 1975; all other members served for the full 2½ year tenure of the Group. The Group met nine times for a total of 16 days, and a small working group met several times to implement the Group's directives.

Defining 'The Individual, Language and Society' (I.L. & S.)

One of the first tasks undertaken by the Group was that of defining its areas of concern. This proved to be difficult because, as has been mentioned, I.L. & S. (Individual, Language and Society) is not a well-articulated and officially recognized field of study which can conveniently be subsumed by a single, existing rubric.. Because it is central to a number of disciplines, it was necessary to generate a definition which incorporated those disciplines but which was not so broad that it provided no direction and not so narrow that it led to a very particularistic view.

The Group took, as its starting point, three salient features of Canadian society, the Charter languages, Native languages and Immigrant languages and identified eight dimensions operative in each of these categories (Language Maintenance, Language Learning, Language Acculturation, Language

Pattern Changes, Language Barriers {including dimensions of ethnic prejudice}, Language Deprivation, Non-Verbal Communication, Diversity and Standardization) which have consequence for large numbers of Canadians. These 8 themes appeared to cover meaningfully the range of issues central to I.L. & S. in such a way that they could be the focus of study by researchers in a variety of disciplines. To further the boundaries of the area, it was decided that the focus would be on: a. Linguistic studies with a social component; b. psychological studies with a language component; and c. social studies with a language component. With some refinements, that early definition is embodied in the list of themes which has guided the Group throughout its work. Those themes are:

Theme 1: LANGUAGE CONTACT IN CANADA.

This theme is intended to subsume a number of issues:

- (a) What form language contact takes and why it takes that form?
Such phenomena as mass bilingualism, language brokers and bilingual elites are germane here.
- (b) This issue may be sub-divided into social implications such as ethnic identity, social organization, friendship patterns and community dynamics, and linguistic implications such as borrowing and language change.

Theme 2: THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOURAL IMPLICATIONS OF BILINGUALISM IN CANADA.

The focus of this theme is the differences for the individual which are consequent upon his being bilingual. What effects are there on his social behaviour? What characterizes his social interaction patterns? Does he, for example, have contacts with the other language group, with a bilingual group, or do his interaction patterns remain within his original language group? What are his attitudes toward others? How does his bilingualism affect the way in which others perceive him? What kind of status, acceptability and power are a consequence of his bilingualism?

Theme 3: INDIVIDUAL, SOCIAL AND STRUCTURAL FACTORS IN LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND RESTORATION IN CANADA.

Generally, the concern of this theme is with the antecedents of language maintenance. At the level of the individual, the focus is on attitudes and values; at the social level, it is the influence of social norms and roles, family and reference group; at the institutional level, it is the

impact of school, mass media, church, work-setting, and government.

Theme 4:

FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE IN CANADA

The intent here is to go beyond the basic function of language as a vehicle for communicating ideas, thoughts and feelings, and to focus on it as social phenomenon. How does language function as a cue to ethnic identity, and social status? What is the social significance of a bilingual's use of his different languages in the home, in public, in intimate relations? How does language use serve as a means of accommodation, or of indirectly communicating social distance?

Theme 5:

SOCIAL FACTORS IN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND BILINGUALITY IN CANADA.

This theme calls for an explication of the social phenomena which are promoting bilingualism. It should include consideration of:

- (a) Factors affecting attitudes toward second-language acquisition;
- (b) Motivational factors in second-language acquisition, e.g. integrative vs. instrumental;
- (c) Social costs and benefits contingent on second-language learning, e.g. loss of identity, time and effort, economic advancement, prestige.

Theme 6:

VARIETIES OF INSTITUTIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL BILINGUALISM IN CANADA.

The concern here is with the different social implications of institutional bilingualism as opposed to individual bilingualism. What are the implications of an institutional bilingualism in which members of two language groups are not bilingual but can deal with institutions in their own language? How does that kind of bilingualism contrast with a situation in which all members of the two groups are bilingual so that institutional bilingualism is not necessary? What are the results of a situation in which these two forms of bilingualism are combined? How does reciprocal vs. non-reciprocal bilingualism function and what are their effects on behaviour? In which situation will the two language groups thrive? Under what circumstances can inter-group conflict be expected.

Theme 7:

LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND COGNITION IN CANADA.

The concern here, of course, is with the relationship of culture to cognition, and how these variables influence, or are influenced by, language. How are cultural and cognitive differences reflected in language in ways that make communication with other groups more or less difficult? How

does learning two languages influence cognition? Is there a danger that learning a second language may not facilitate better communication because of differences in the cognitive systems underlying the two languages? And, what is the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence?

Theme 8:

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN CANADA - POLITICS AND PRACTICES.
The concern here is with policy alternatives and their consequences. Can language usage be legislated? What are the implications of standardizing language? Should, for example, Quebec and British Columbia have different policies on language? Or, should Indian and Eskimo languages be standardized? What is the role of the mass media in language standardization?

Identifying Individual, Language and Society (I.L.&S.) Scholars

Having defined the scope of I.L. & S., a major effort was directed toward identifying and establishing contact with scholars working in the area of the Group's concern. In following this tack, the 'few-wise-men approach' was rejected in favour of broad participation by all those working in the field. It was assumed that the involvement of all the relevant scholars would provide a more diverse range of problems and proposed solutions and, at the same time, create greater interest in the work of the Group. Since successful implementation of most recommendations made will depend on the attitudes of the scholars, what they are thinking is especially important. Hence, much effort was devoted to the compilation of a roster of all who were active in the Canadian scholarly community. The task was difficult because our enterprise cuts across disciplinary lines and because the relevant literature is fragmented in a variety of journals (Most of them non-Canadian specialty journals).

Our initial list, derived from personal knowledge of Group members and from reviews of various literatures, was extended through requests-for-information published in 34 journals read by scholars likely to be interested in the work of the Committee. Each of those identified, by whatever means, was invited to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix A) which contained questions concerning the respondent's research interests and activities, and his assessment of the

current state and future directions, of I.L. & S. research.

Analysis of Questionnaire Data

The responses to questions 1 (What are you currently doing....) and 2 (What have you done in the past 10 years....) were used to identify those respondents who are clearly involved in I.L. & S. research.

The responses to questions 3 (What are the 2 or 3 main issues in the study of I.L. & S. today?) and 4 (What do you see as being the most exciting new directions for research.....and what practical problems do you see...?) were classified and analysed with respect to the discipline and the language of the respondent, in order to identify any differences in interests and emphases which might be related to disciplinary or linguistic allegiances.

In order to assess the relative amounts of research being carried out on each of the 8 themes as they applied to the 3 language categories (Charter, Native and Immigrant languages) a number of analyses of the research reported by the respondents were undertaken. The research of each respondent was classified as: (1) being primarily in the area of (a) linguistic studies with a social component, (b) psychological studies with a language component, or (c) social studies with a language component; (2) being related to one, or more, of the 8 themes outlined on pages 4, 5 & 6. These 2 classifications were then combined to provide an index of the number and percentage of respondents working in each of the 3 areas with research interests which are related to each of the 8 themes. And, finally, the most frequently occurring groupings of themes were calculated to further clarify what kinds of research are being done.

Learned Societies

To further publicize the work of the Group and to elicit support for its efforts, a symposium was mounted at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, and Committee representatives were at the meetings of the Learned Societies, and of the International Congress of Sociology when it met in Toronto.

Public Contacts

To ensure that scholars and the C.G.I.L. & S. were not working in a social vacuum, numerous lay societies, government agencies and commissions, as well as some educational groups were contacted. Included were: the Native Council of Canada, the National Indian Brotherhood, the Innuit Tapirisat, Deans of Canadian Graduate Schools, the Law Reform Commission, the Ontario School Trustees' Association, the Commission on Canadian Studies, and the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board. In addition, Canadian Government Departments and agencies which are most concerned with I.L. & S. studies were contacted and asked specifically about their research in the area. They included: The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, The Public Service Commission, The Office of the Secretary of State, The Treasury Board, The Department of Communications and the National Museums of Canada.

I.L. & S. National Planning Symposium

To provide depth to its assessment of the state of I. L. & S. scholarly research, the Group organized a National Planning Symposium, which was held from the 29th of November to the 2nd of December, 1975, inclusive, at the Gordon Conference Centre of Queen's University in Kingston. Attendance was by invitation only. Delegates were chosen on the basis of research

interests and disciplinary affiliation, with the objective of bringing together a distinguished group which was broadly representative of I.L. & S. activity in Canada. In preparation for the Symposium, the Consultative Group commissioned Drs. Frank Vallee and John de Vries, of the Department of Sociology of Carleton University, to prepare a data book on the topic of The Individual, Language and Society. The book (Vallee and de Vries, 1975) provides information on selected demographic features of ethnicity and language in Canada, based on reports of Statistics Canada, as well as certain summaries from other sources. It includes, as well, listings of research interests of scholars throughout the country.

The Symposium brought together 29 scholars, with diverse areas of specialization, and 6 government and university administrators. (See Appendix C for names and affiliations of delegates). Eight of the symposiasts were charged with preparing papers outlining and assessing the state of the themes assigned to them and with judging what work needs to be done within the 3 areas of Charter, Immigrant and Native languages, what the research priorities should be, and what Canada Council and other groups can do to facilitate the realization of these priorities. For each of the theme papers, two symposiasts (usually from disciplines different from that of the author of the paper) prepared critical assessments of the theme paper. (These papers, supplemented by commentaries prepared by members of the C.G.I.L. & S. in the light of the discussion at the Symposium and of their own experience, is being published in book-form for easy reference by interested persons (Coons, Taylor and Tremblay, 1977)). The theme papers, and those of the discussants, were circulated to all symposiasts prior to the Symposium, itself, so that they when they arrived they were well informed about the views of the other participants and were well prepared for informed discussion.

At the Symposium, half a day was devoted to the discussion of each theme-paper and its two discussion papers. Each session was recorded in its entirety and, in addition, specified individuals kept a written summary of what transpired. (See Appendix D for the format of the Symposium).

After the Symposium, designated members of the Consultative Group, drawing on the deliberations of the Consultative Group, itself, the Symposium papers, the written summaries of the substance of the discussions and, when necessary, the actual tape-recordings, prepared brief statements designed to outline the essential elements which emerged with respect to each theme.

III. RESULTS

Questionnaires to Scholars

Identification of I.L. & S. Scholars

The variety of attempts to identify all scholars interested in I.L. & S. studies in Canada produced the names of 312 persons to whom questionnaires were mailed. Of those 168 returned completed (or near-completed) questionnaires, 8 of whom reported that their work clearly did not fall within the purview of the Consultative Group. A further 26 responses to the advertisements placed in various journals were received after the Survey was completed. Thus, 186 respondents saw their activities as being potentially related to the terms-of-reference of the Consultative Group. However, classification of their work (as reported in answer to questions 1 & 2 of the Questionnaire) in the light of the guidelines outlined on page 3, indicated that only 96 can clearly be considered to have I.L. & S. research interests. (See Appendix B)

The larger group ($N=186$) was used in analysing questions 3 & 4, since it was decided that the views of the 90 respondents who did not fall squarely into the I.L. & S. area, were nevertheless, well-informed (through teaching pertinent courses or researching related areas) and should be heeded. In analysing research interests, of course, only the 96 classified as clearly being active I.L. & S. researchers could be used.

The main issues in I.L. & S. studies

Question 3 of the Questionnaire was concerned with the respondents' views about what constituted the important issues in I.L. & S. research today.

One hundred and eighteen responses to this question were received. They

are presented as the responses of:

- sociologists
- anthropologists
- psychologists
- linguists
- others in the field
- francophones
- anglophones

The numbers are too small for quantitative analysis. What is provided, therefore, is a listing of the major preoccupations of respondents in these groups, usually with some indication of the number sharing each view.

Sociologists (N = 10)

Four sociologists listed issues related specifically to the French-English situation in Canada. The other six included some mention of the non-official languages. Some issues raised were the social and cultural consequences of bilingualism, the viability of a bilingual - bicultural state, the social aspects of multi-culturalism such as: immigrant and native education, cultural identity, influence of the communications media on language diversity, maintenance of non-official languages, language as a sign of group membership.

Anthropologists (N = 20)

For the most part, anthropologists were concerned with the maintenance of the non-official languages and cultures. Indigenous groups, it was felt, are suffering a loss of economic independence and cultural values, which are engendering a crisis of personality, part of which involves the rejection of the native language. A way must be found to restore and preserve native languages and cultures for their own sake and for the enrichment of the Canadian culture as a whole.

Concerning immigrant minority groups, the issues most often mentioned were assimilation, adjustment and identity. The question of the realpolitik of a multi-lingual state was raised, along with the related issues of language and social standing, language and group membership, and the subordinate power relationship of minority language groups. The consequences of assimilation and language loss, both from a group and an individual perspective, were also listed as main issues.

Psychologists (N = 24)

Psychologists, as did sociologists and anthropologists, showed a concern for the language situation of ethnic and native groups. Nine mentioned the relationship of language and minority group membership as a major issue. And, again, there was concern for the role of language in forming an individual's identity, especially as related to his group membership.

Issues raised especially by psychologists, were the questions of language education, and language and cognition. Concerning the former, some psychologists referred to the social factors in language learning and the social psychology of bilingualism, while others focussed on teaching techniques and ways of assessing them.

Psychologists also recognized a need to study the significance of and the alternative to, a bi- or multi-cultural society.

Linguists (N = 27)

The linguists who responded to this question, seemed very alert to the social dimensions of language, mentioning issues such as the following: the relationship between language and poverty, economic aspects of bi-culturalism, government policy and language, the school system's role in language evolution, bilingualism and social function, attitudes towards language, social structure

of the interaction of linguistic groups, social motivations for language learning.

Linguists, too, were concerned with the notion of a bi- or multi-lingual (or cultural) society. They mentioned the factors of prejudice and political and economic forces, and wondered about the viability of a language outside of its culture. They also mentioned the psychology of language loss as a major issue; and a few mentioned the issue of language quality.

Others in the field (N = 34)

Besides members of the disciplines already considered, responses were solicited from demographers, political scientists, geographers, administrators, educators and others interested and involved in matters relating to I.L. & S. The range of issues mentioned by this assembly was very broad indeed.

The largest number (13) was concerned with the viability of the French nation in Canada, and the political dimension of languages in Canada in general. Within this category issues mentioned ranged from the question of the survival of the French language in Canada as it is helped or hindered by present legislative action, to the use of French in the Public Service, to constitutional problems associated with multi-lingualism, e.g., in education.

Those in the field of education were chiefly concerned with second language teaching and learning, education in the mother (non-official) tongue, and the quality of language education generally.

The relationship of language to group identity, and the possibility of multi-culturalism were, again, mentioned several times.

Francophones (N = 38)

Of the francophone respondents, 13 confined their mention of main

issues to those relating to the French-English situation in Canada, particularly to bilingualism. The concerns within this sub-group included the question of the survival of French in Canada, the economic aspects of bi-culturalism, the loss of French outside Quebec, cultural and psychological adjustments to bilingualism, immersion French programs.

There was widespread recognition among the other 25 francophone respondents, of the situation of the non-official language groups. Fourteen of these explicitly mentioned issues related to the non-official languages. Some were concerned with the relationship between official bilingualism and the survival of the non-official languages; others with the general question of minority language as a factor in social status and social functioning. Several mentioned the common social aspects of being francophone and of being altophone. There were a number of general references to the sociology of language use.

A lack of concern for the cognitional aspects of language was apparent among the 38 francophone respondents.. Only two mentioned the relationship between language and cognition as a main issue. The francophones who did refer to the psychological effects of language, often tied these to the social functions of language and focussed particularly on language as a factor in identity-formation.

Anglophones (N = 80)

Relatively fewer anglophones revealed a preoccupation with the French-English language situation in Canada: only 16 respondents mentioned aspects of the official language situation as the only main issues in the field. The overall question of language maintenance in Canada, and the related question of the maintenance of minority group identities, were, however, as with francophones, a major concern. Eleven respondents, for instance, made direct reference to

the maintenance of native languages as a major issue. There was more concern among anglophone respondents about the attitudes towards language than among francophone respondents. Peculiar to anglophones were references to the role of the educational system in forming attitudes and identities of language groups.

As with francophones, there were few references among the anglophones to issues which were not related to bi- or multi-lingualism. However, some issues were mentioned: functions of language in the learning process, cognitive effects of language, social significance of dialect and expression, and relationship of size of language group to accessibility to a written culture.

SUMMARY

Certain predominant issues appear in the responses of all seven groups. There is widespread concern for the issues of non-official language maintenance, language as a factor in self and group identity, language as a factor in social status and socio-economic success, the socio-political dimensions of language in Canada vis-a-vis both the possibility of bilingual and bicultural state and a multi-lingual, multi-cultural state, the social and psychological factors in inter-language group contact, and second language education.

Future directions for I.L. & S. Research

Question 4 of the Questionnaire was concerned with what the respondents thought were the most exciting new directions for I.L. & S. research and what practical problems are likely to deter their scholarly pursuit. Differences in frequencies of responses to questions 3 and 4 stem from the fact that not all respondents answered both questions.

Sociologists (N = 10)

There seemed to be no consensus among the respondents. The new

directions for research which were mentioned were the following: the reflection of cultural change in linguistic patterns; laboratory socio-linguistic studies; studies on the use of the official languages; the role of bilinguals as mediators; large scale multi-disciplinary work; language maintenance prediction; language maintenance and its relation to ethnic group status; bi- and multi-lingualism and its impact on an individual's definition of social reality; bilingualism and conflict.

As hindrances to research, time and money were mentioned several times, inaccessibility of data from Statistics Canda was mentioned, as was lack of field-work skill.

Anthropologists (N = 18)

Anthropologists had the highest degree of agreement on the major issues of the day, namely language and culture maintenance for non-official language groups, but they had more diverse opinions on the most exciting directions for research.

Related to maintenance of language and culture, is the theme (mentioned several times) of attitudes and perceptions relative to language, both by the minority and majority groups. Two anthropologists felt that a closer working relationship with the ethnic groups was desirable, since the active participation of the subjects could add an important new dimension to research.

Among the other new directions for research mentioned by this group were: studies using the semiological and semantic approaches current in France, the functioning of language in everyday life, education in the mother tongue, sociolinguistic dialectology in Canada, and influence of underlying ideological views on semantic and linguistic phenomena.

The deterrents to research as seen by anthropologists, aside from a few references to time and money, were: a lack of academically trained native people, political forces acting on the allotment of resources, a lack of good linguistic formation among anthropologists, the absence, in the case of socio-linguistic studies, of complete histories of the individual persons studied.

Psychologists (N = 20)

Only in one area did a number (6) of psychologists seem to converge in their description of major new research directions, and that was the area of language and cognition. The various themes mentioned were: cognitive and problem-solving strategies related to language patterns, the relationship of language to general development, and the relationship of bilingualism to general development; verbal regulation of behaviour as related to remedial work and inter-language group relations; the thinking processes of native children; the use of bilinguals to answer questions about cognitive processes, non-linguistic perceptual (including social-perceptual) factors in language acquisition.

Despite the fact that the psychologists frequently listed as current major issues the questions of multi-lingualism and minority group identity, and non-official language maintenance these issues do not appear very often as exciting new directions for research. Four psychologists made some reference to research on immigrant and native groups or the significance of multiculturalism.

The psychologists answered the question of research deterrents more carefully than others. There was no particular theme common to the responses, save for a number of references to time and money. Problems such as the following were listed: the lack of a genuine Canadian psychology, i.e., with Canada as its frame of reference; inability of psychologists in Canada to

communicate in languages other than their mother-tongue; difficulty of cross-cultural comparability; biases and prejudices of white researchers; political forces determining research support; opposing disciplinary orientations and priorities; influence of foreign theoretical schools; lack of co-operation by subjects of another culture; lack of recognition by researchers of sub-cultures within the main groups in Canada; lack of willingness to do applied research.

Linguists (N = 27)

Many linguists gave a substantial response to the question about new research directions, and almost all of them saw some aspects of socio-, psycho- or ethno-linguistics as most exciting.

Respondents' views fall in five small groups of approximately equal proportion: psychological aspects of language; social aspects of language; native language studies; linguistic aspects of multi-lingualism; second-language teaching.

Themes mentioned in psycho-linguistics were: language and behaviour as related to preattentive mechanisms; language as a conceptual framework; analysis techniques of generative semantics; the use of bilinguals to study the relationship between thought and language; psychological effects of bilingualism.

Themes mentioned in socio-linguistics were: cross-cultural attitude studies as related to language usage; how language legislation affects language usage; the social value of a language in a bi- or multi-lingual setting; linguistic competence and social status; how to provide non-territorial structures for cultural linguistic development and interaction.

Themes in native language studies were: child development and native language; relationship of language and culture; curriculum materials and paedagogical techniques for teaching native languages as first language.

Themes concerning multi-lingualism were: comparative strengths and weaknesses of various languages; the alternative to bi- or multi-lingualism; community-based language maintenance programmes.

Themes in the field of second language teaching were: effectiveness and effects of immersion programmes, second-language acquisition as a process of creative construction, basically analogous to that of native language acquisition.

Deterrents: Only two opinions on research deterrents (other than a shortage of funds) were frequently expressed: (1) the lack of personnel competent in both the sociological or psychological domain as well as in linguistics itself; (2) the growing resistance of native people to researchers. Other problems mentioned were: prejudice and bias; difficulty of interdisciplinary communication; lack of support for pilot stages of projects; lack of recognition of importance of research by universities.

Others interested and involved in the field (N = 33)

The largest degree of interest (13 responses) was expressed in research into the nature and potential endurance of minority cultures within Canadian society. Along this line, the following topics were mentioned: the need to develop a cost/benefit method for assessing multiculturalism; significance of great differences between the sociolinguistics of native Indian and Indo-european languages; the impact of Government programmes on French communities outside Quebec; interdisciplinary baseline studies of productive multi-cultural mature citizens in Canadian society today; development of cultural teaching modules (based on the many ethnic groups in Canada) which could be used in English- and French-language elementary schools; research into minority-language retention; factors involved in inter-cultural conflict; values, life styles and motivations of different ethnic groups;

political and social acceptance of cultural diversity; group self-images; the conditions which determine the life expectancy of languages; action research in which different ethnic groups try out mutual problem-solving; devising research instruments for ethno-linguistics; the cognitive processes of multilinguals.

Ten others focussed on research into second-language learning or bilingualism. Here, such issues as the following were mentioned: bilingualism and social conflict; psychological aspects, including motivation, of second-language learning; quality of second-language teaching among anglophones and francophones; development of a test to identify children who would most profit by French immersion; psychological acceptance of a second language; opportunity and motivation in second-language learning; development of bilingual education programmes running from kindergarten to adulthood.

Aside from these two major fields of interest, there were only scattered references to language and cognition (e.g. socio-linguistic aesthetics), and the Canadian political and social context in general.

Deterrents. There were several references to the difficulties involved in an interdisciplinary approach of the sort which was seen to be required in this field, and several to a need for greater rationalization and communication within the overall research effort in the field. As usual, some said that prejudices inhibited research, and others complained of lack of time, funds and interest. A number said that there were insufficient basic data, especially for longitudinal studies, on languages in Canada.

SUMMARY

New directions: Overall, what were perceived to be the exciting new directions in research, followed the pattern of what were perceived to be the main issues in I.L. & S. research today.

The relationship of language to cognition appeared more often as a 'new direction' than it did as a 'major current issue', and received considerable attention, especially from linguists and psychologists. The same may be said for research into attitudes towards languages. The final word must be that responses were exceedingly diverse and usually too general for any sort of precise analysis.

Deterrents to Research: Here, again, one may point to a few generally mentioned issues: the difficulty and need for inter-disciplinary training and co-operation; a need for increased access to basic data and more basic data; and prejudices against research.

Distribution of research interests by area and theme.

As Table I indicates, researchers are distributed approximately equally across the 3 sub-areas of I.L. & S. studies, viz., A. Linguistic studies with a social component; B. Psychological studies with a linguistic component; and C. Social studies with a language component.

TABLE I - RESEARCH INTERESTS OF 96

I.L. & S. RESEARCHERS BY AREA

Area	Number of respondents in area	(%) Percentage of researchers in area
A	32	33.3
B	31	32.2
C	33	34.3
TOTAL*	96	100%

Area A - Linguistic studies with a social component.

Area B - Psychological studies with a linguistic component.

Area C - Sociological studies with a linguistic component.

*Each respondent was classified in one area only.

It should be recalled that, while the 96 researchers identified as being actively conducting I.L. & S. research are included in these data, the level of research productivity is not accounted for. However, with Ns of 32, 31 and 33 in areas A,B, and C respectively, it is reasonable to expect comparable numbers of highly productive researchers to fall in each area and inspection of the publication records of these 96 scholars suggests that this expectation is met.

Table II indicates the numbers and percentages of the 96 scholars whose research is related to each of the 8 themes. It is important to realize (as Column 2, Table II suggests) that some researchers are doing research on more than one theme and that some research includes components of 2 or more themes.

It is clear from Table II, that the first 5 themes are receiving attention

from a substantially greater number of researchers than are themes 6, 7 and 8.

TABLE II - RESEARCH INTERESTS OF 96

I.L. & S. RESEARCHERS BY THEME

Theme	Number of respondents* whose work relates to theme	Percentage of researchers whose work relates to theme
1	38	39.5
2	35	36.4
3	40	41.6
4	41	42.7
5	31	32.2
6	13	13.5
7	21	21.8
8	15	15.6

Theme 1 - Language contact in Canada

Theme 2 - The social and behavioural implications of bilingualism in Canada

Theme 3 - Individual, Social and Structural factors in language maintenance and restoration in Canada

Theme 4 - Functions of language in Canada

Theme 5 - Social factors in language acquisition and bilingualism in Canada

Theme 6 - Varieties of institutional and individual bilingualism in Canada

Theme 7 - Language, culture and cognition in Canada

Theme 8 - Language planning in Canada - politics and practices

*Respondent's research often relates to more than one theme.

Table III shows how the research of the respondents in each area is distributed across the 8 themes. For example, 18 (58%) of those doing linguistic studies with a social component have research which bears on language contact, but only one (2.7%) is involved with language, culture and cognition. And, of those doing psychological studies with a social component, 17 (54.8%) are involved with language, culture and cognition, but only one (3.2%) is involved with language planning.

TABLE III - PATTERNS OF RESEARCH WITHIN EACH AREA

Area	Number of researchers in each area with research related to various themes							
	Theme	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A	18	14	17	13	13	5	1	6
B	4	13	8	8	12	4	17	1
C	15	9	15	18	6	3	3	7
% of researchers in various areas with research in various themes								
A	58.0	43.7	53.1	40.6	40.6	15.6	2.7	16.6
B	12.9	41.9	25.8	25.8	38.7	12.9	54.8	3.2
C	45.4	27.2	45.4	54.4	18.1	9.1	9.1	22.2

Table IV indicates the manner in which researchers' interests are distributed across themes. For example, it is relatively common for researchers to have interests in both themes 2 and 5 (21.8% of them had studies involving those 2 themes), but relatively uncommon for them to have interests in both themes 1 and 8 (only 8.3%).

TABLE IV - MOST FREQUENTLY OCCURRING GROUPINGS OF THEMES

Grouping of themes	Number of times themes appear grouped together	Percentage of researchers with research in groupings %
2,5	21	21.8
1,4	21	21.8
1,3	18	18.7
3,4	16	16.6
1,3,4	11	11.4
2,3	10	10.4
1,8	8	8.3

Graduate Studies on I.L. & S.

Twenty-two of the 40 Graduate Faculties contacted replied to the request that they furnish lists of theses underway in the area of I.L. & S. studies. Of these 22, 6 indicated that no pertinent work was being undertaken. The other 16 reported 22 theses, undertaken in the previous 2 years, which were concerned with I.L. & S. issues. The names of the responding universities, the titles of the theses, their authors and their academic units are reported in Appendix E.

I.L. & S. research supported by Canadian Government Departments and Agencies

At present (1976) there is no complete list of research supported by the Government of Canada. The Directory of Federally Supported Research in Universities, published by the Information Exchange Centre of the National Research Council, listed none of the research projects which is included in Appendix F. The Directory does not include contract research (only research grants) and does not cover certain government departments (e.g. Treasury

Board, Secretary of State). To obtain information it was, therefore, necessary to contact directly the relevant offices. Thus, it is not certain that all I.L. & S. research supported by the Canadian Government has been identified.

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs
(D.I.N.A.)

Research Division, Policy Planning and Research Branch

The division has not yet carried out or sponsored research in sociolinguistics. They are now (1976) studying the feasibility of a large scale socio-linguistic survey of the Mackenzie Valley.

Elementary and Secondary School Division, Education Branch

This division is concerned with the development of native language education programs. They do support applied local research (dialects, educational materials) but no basic research into the psycho or sociological aspects of language.

Inuit Language Commission

The Commission is a joint venture of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (D.I.N.A.) and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. Its purpose was to investigate the need and possibilities associated with the standardization and preservation of the Inuit language. Though the Commission's work was basically politically oriented, a wealth of source material was collected, much of it through interviews, concerning differences in dialect and attitudes toward language standardization and preservation.

Public Service Commission

Language Research Section, Language Standards and Test Development Division, Official Languages Program

In-house research has been conducted on second language retention after language training in the Public Service.

Studies Division, Language Bureau

In-house research has been conducted into the functions of language in an organizational setting.

Secretary of State

Language Programs Branch

Appendix F contains a complete list of projects supported by the Secretary of State intended eventually to assist in promoting official bilingualism in Canada. Research is by contract.

This division of the Department of the Secretary of State has sponsored a number of large scale I.L. & S. research projects:

- 1) Non-official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism,
K.G. O'Bryan, et. al., OISE, reported published 1975.
- 2) Majority attitudes study, J. Berry and D. Taylor.
- 3) Supplementary Schools Study, Panu and Young.

Treasury Board

Information not yet (1976) available.

Department of Communications

Social Programs Division, Social Policy and Program Branch

Research has been sponsored in the field of the social impact of communications technology, but not particularly from the linguistic perspective. Only one project seemed to be more than peripherally related to I.L. & S. studies and that was a study of the French community of Zenon Park, Saskatchewan from a sociological and linguistic perspective, focussing on the social and cultural animation within the community.

Director: B.S. Wilhelm, University of Regina.

National Museums of Canada

National Museum of Man

Canadian Centre for Folk Culture Studies

The Centre sponsors and co-ordinates a great deal of research into the ethnography and folk cultures of the many ethnic sub-cultures of Canada. Some of this work is of an ethno-linguistic nature. A list of the relevant projects is included in Appendix F. There are many purely linguistic studies of the non-official languages supported by the Centre, primarily as 'urgent-ethnology' or preservative projects. At present the Centre has five major programs underway: Anglo-Celtic, French-Romance, German-Scandinavian, Oriental-Asiatic, Slavic and East-European.

Canada Council Support for I.L. & S. Research

Table V shows the levels of Canada Council's financial support for I.L. & S. research during the years 1968-1974. During that 6-year period 82 grants were made in the amount of \$1,173,835, which accounted for 4.4% of the Council's total research budget for that period

TABLE V
CANADA COUNCIL SUPPORT FOR
I.L. & S. RESEARCH
1968 - 1974

Fiscal Year	Canada Council Support to Individual, Language & Society Projects		% of total Research Grants
	Awards	\$	
1968-1969	12	173,770	5.8
1969-1970	16	167,947	3.9
1970-1971	12	180,865	4.1
1971-1972	10	121,856	3.3
1972-1973	15	208,236	5.0
1973-1974	17	321,161	6.6
TOTAL	82	1,173,835	4.4

The National Planning Symposium's View of 'The State of the Art'

THEME I

Language in Contact in Canada

The title chosen for this Theme paper was perhaps too broad. For a person in one paper to touch more than two bases in circling such a large field is a heavy requirement. Professor de Vries, who presented the main paper in this session, decided to focus on research into language patterns and trends from a demographic perspective. It became clear during the group and plenary discussions that many thought de Vries' mandate was, or ought to have been, to discuss research into the dynamics of speech behaviour where people who command different repertoires and codes come into direct contact with one another. Certainly, vital questions that exercise the wits of psycho- and socio-linguists can only be answered by research based on observation of people interacting in face-to-face situations, whether in laboratory or 'natural' settings, as Professor Cedergren pointed out in her discussion paper.. However, these were not the kinds of questions to which de Vries addressed his paper.

As he states in his introduction, de Vries is interested in those factors and processes affecting the size and composition of language groups. He has in mind 'standard' languages identifiable by a name (e.g., English, German, Ukrainian, etc.) rather than language dialects. His units of description and analysis are languages in this sense; populations at different levels of aggregation; characteristics of these populations; and a variety of processes which may be pictured as threading the connections among the populations, their characteristics and their language knowledge and use patterns.

His application of the demographic perspective is clearly illustrated in his paper as well as in the Data Book to which he was the chief contributor. From the application of his model a long series of language-contact questions emerge. He then evaluates the research scene in Canada in terms of how

existing studies contribute answers to some of these questions.

Because Canada is a multilingual country in which language issues have drawn much public attention, one might have expected to find a substantial corpus of firm findings on the questions pertaining to language maintenance and shift which de Vries enumerates. However, the corpus is far from substantial. It is least satisfactory for what de Vries calls 'flow' data as distinct from 'stock' data. The latter denotes the number of persons who are reported to have certain characteristics at a given time, for example, the number of persons who are reported to know or to speak specified languages in 1971. A good example of flow data is provided by vital statistics of birth and death, numbers of migrants entering and leaving. Flow data combined with stock data permit the calculation of rates of change. Insofar as research in Canada on language shift and maintenance is concerned, there are no data available on birth, death, migration, by language group. Consequently researchers have to employ various approximation techniques.

Research of the type de Vries reviews makes heavy use of the stock data in the Canadian Census of population. On the one hand, this source of data, very much abundant when compared to language data from other countries, is underexploited in Canada. Examples of this underexploitation of census data and of such new techniques as geo-coding available through Statistics Canada were given by de Vries as well as by participants in group discussion. On the other hand, many who use the data do not pay sufficient attention to its limitations, especially to the problems of reliability and validity inherent in questions dealing with ethnic origin and language. These limitations, and others arising from editing procedures at Statistics Canada, are touched upon in the de Vries paper and amplified in the Data Book. He suggests that some

linguists and sociolinguists refuse to use the census because of reliability and/or validity problems, and because these are self-report data. It is de Vries' view that scholars should concentrate on helping Statistics Canada correct these problems and devise census questions which would satisfy the criteria of demographers and sociologists if not those of linguists and sociolinguists.

On this score, de Vries had a number of concrete suggestions to make, such as the dropping of the questionable ethnic origin question and the substitution for it of a question on main language. Furthermore, he argued that the Statistics Canada tabulation program could be reviewed and attempts made to link stock and flow data in census publications. This suggestion was taken up in discussion and support was given to the idea of linking various records or data sets in order to test hypotheses about the associations between language patterns and such variables as intermarriage, type of occupation, mobility experiences, birthplace, etc. Linkages could be made between the annual surveys of the labour force, vital statistics, and the census, for example.

Neither of the discussants, both of whom are linguists, were enthusiastic about census data. Cedergren, who, as we shall see presently, focussed attention on language contact at the level of face-to-face interaction, thought census data too gross and approximate to be of use in much linguistic work. Darbelnet was uncertain that the costs of correcting the deficiencies in the census and other surveys, deficiencies which he also explored, were worth the effort.

As de Vries pointed out, there was some limited value for the study of language patterns and trends in surveys which did not use the census as a data base. Such surveys are rare, perhaps because of the heavy cost of mounting them, where the intention is to generalize for more than small

populations. The prohibitive costs of special surveys to get at language patterns and trends need not be a deterrent, for one could 'piggy-back' one or two language questions onto regular surveys conducted by the government, such as the Survey of Consumer Expenditure or the Monthly Labour Force Survey. There is merit in studies of language contact and its consequences at the community or institutional levels. However, there has been little or no coordination among these studies with the result that generalizations which apply beyond the specific communities or institutions are difficult or impossible to make.

Professor Cedergren presented a quite different perspective than that of de Vries on questions of language contact. The sociolinguistic perspective uses the speech community as the fundamental unit of description and analysis. The primary data for studies of multilingual settings is gathered within the speech community by participant observers and whole conversations are the units analyzed. She gave examples of the application of this method in studies among Italian immigrants in Montreal. The focus of interest in this kind of study is on actual language use in face-to-face interaction, a completely different focus from that of the language demographer.

The contrasting of these approaches gave rise to discussion of the fit between macro-level and micro-level studies, a topic which received much attention during the conference. The opinion was expressed in group discussions that generalizations emerging from the kind of study advocated by Cedergren can generate questions which the language demographer may help to answer, and may even feed back to guide such matters as wording of census and other survey questions. On the other hand, findings from studies using the demographic perspective could inspire research design for studies at the

community, institutional or small group level. Cedergren proposed that "certain strategic research sites be designated and that the determinants of language use be investigated concurrently by sociologists, demographers, linguists and social-psychologists, in order to obtain a multilevel description of language contact". The closing suggestion of de Vries' paper seems to jibe with this proposal, for he pointed to the need for training in various disciplines which relate to socio-linguistics to provide the kind of teams to undertake such multilevel studies.

Professor Darbelnet, who had many insightful remarks to make about concepts like bilingualism, drew attention to one neglected domain - that of scholars who work in more than one language. Another domain to which attention was drawn in discussion was the mass media - papers, radio and television. Several similar suggestions were offered by way of expanding the research universe beyond surveys or small group interaction. In many cases participants at the conference were able to cite one or two studies by way of example, but it became evident that there were few connections among these studies and little in the way of cumulation in the sense of researchers shaping their studies to build on previous or concurrent ones. Even in those sectors in which the research enterprise was fairly substantial, for example, in studies of English and French language patterns and trends within and outside Quebec, there is evidence presented at the symposium that the authors from one language community seldom refer to the works of authors from the other language community, which is in itself a commentary on language contact in Canada!

The Social and Behavioural Implications of Bilingualism in Canada

Theme 2

The focus of most research in the area of bilingualism has been the conditions which facilitate or hinder the development of second language skills, (see Theme 5). An equally important issue is the social and behavioural consequences of becoming bilingual. This latter question has not been thoroughly researched. No doubt this is because Canadian society has been far more concerned with how to promote bilingualism than it has with the consequences of achieving such a status. For the most part it is probably assumed that most of the consequences are positive. It may turn out however that one of the difficulties in promoting bilingualism is precisely the anticipated negative social consequences.

Several types of issues emerged from the Group's discussions and from responses to the questionnaires which pointed to the need for the present theme. It may be, for example, that becoming bilingual results in changes of personality. On the one hand these changes may be in terms of valued dimensions such as confidence, feelings of competence and ease with social encounters. On the other hand it may lead to confusions about the self and uncertainty about group membership.

Viewed from the other perspective, becoming bilingual may affect the way in which the person is perceived by others. These changes in perception may involve a totally new image just as they may be limited to subtle changes in attitude toward the person. Further, members of the person's own group may have a different reaction to the bilingual than members of an out-group.

In terms of social functioning, becoming bilingual may mean that a person's social encounters are widened to include persons in both cultures; however it may also mean that bilingual persons limit their interaction to other bilinguals and thereby constitute a third social group. Following this latter issue it would be important to assess the extent to which becoming bilingual provides the person with a special status as a linguistic "broker" who can mediate interactions between members of two ethnolinguistic groups.

Before discussing the major questions dealt with in the commissioned papers several general impressions emerge which characterize work on this important theme. First, as was pointed out initially, the social and behavioural implications of bilingualism have not been researched thoroughly. Both Segalowitz and Sankoff reinforce this conclusion despite a careful search of the literature. Moreover, with the exception of Saint Jacques' discussion of immigrant bilingualism, all of the examples, and the few studies reported, come from Quebec and the surrounding bilingual belt. Finally, the research has centred on the two disciplines of psychology and sociolinguistics. While these disciplines appear to complement each other well there is a need for more diverse theoretical and methodological approaches.

The commissioned papers on this theme naturally did not deal with all the issues involved in the social and behavioural implications of bilingualism. Nevertheless, the major paper by Segalowitz did capture the essence of this theme by focussing attention on three major questions: the social interaction pattern of bilinguals, the way bilinguals are perceived by other language groups and the important issue of how the bilingual is treated differently from the monolingual by other members of the mother tongue group.

In examining the social interaction pattern of bilinguals, Segalowitz points to several important areas which have only begun to be researched. For example, he notes that one of the consequences of a French Canadian becoming bilingual is a potential intergenerational shift to English. However, the converse does not appear to be the case for English Canadians. These differential consequences of bilingualism for the two groups have obvious fundamental social implications. In a different context these differential consequences are noted by Saint Jacques who concludes "pour l'anglophone, le bilinguisme est un luxe - on l'appelle parfois un bilinguisme de concession - pour le francophone, c'est une nécessité".

The relationship between bilingualism and social interaction with members of the other group does not appear to be one that can be taken for granted. As Segalowitz points out second language skills alone are not sufficient to generate extensive cross-linguistic communication; attitude, motivation and knowledge of the socio-linguistic rules would seem to be important contributors.

Segalowitz documents how little is known about the reactions of the second language group to the bilingual. While it seems reasonable to expect that someone who learns "my" language would be perceived favourably, we are reminded that there has been speculation that the bilingual may sometimes be viewed as a linguistic spy; an outsider who is trying to pose as a member of the group.

The third issue raised in the Segalowitz paper is the reactions of the mother-tongue group to one of its members becoming bilingual. This is a question which has not been dealt with in the literature. However the social

implications are clearly important. It is possible, for example, that because language is an important symbol of ethnic identity, bilinguals might be perceived as not loyal to their own group.

In certain respects, the directions for future research are clear. Some of the issues have been raised, very little empirical research is available, what little research exists focusses exclusively on French/English bilingualism, and hence the needs are evident. However, there remain important methodological issues to be resolved if future research is to make a relevant contribution to the present theme. To begin with, Sankoff believes there is a fundamental need for micro studies of bilingualism "c'est-à-dire, d'études 'naturalistes' ou ethnographiques sur la nature et le contenu de l'interaction sociale des bilingues au Canada". This view is shared by Saint Jacques as well as Segalowitz who notes that it is crucial "to have basic information about how the bilingual functions in his or her more immediate social context". Underscoring such a need is of course the desire for an interdisciplinary approach to the issues.

A second methodological problem lies in the difficulty of defining bilingualism. As we have seen, the extent to which a person is fluent in the second language can have important consequences for how he is perceived. Further, much of the bilingualism of individuals may be a function of the demands of the situation, as in the case of a minority group individual who of necessity must learn French or English. It is difficult to know whether the variables one examines are a function of the bilingualism per se or the status of the group itself. The problem is compounded by the fact that since members of the particular group may, of necessity, be bilingual it is impossible to find monolingual individuals to serve as an appropriate control group.

In summary, the conclusions to be drawn about research on the social and behavioural consequences of bilingualism mirror those raised for many of the themes dealing with the Individual, language and society. First, there is a paucity of research, second there is a need for interdisciplinary research and third, French and English bilingualism has been over represented. There are two issues which are more unique to the present theme. First, there is a need to carefully define the issues within the theme. Until a body of research literature emerges the issues could be left aside in favour of more well defined areas of research on bilingualism. Second, there is a need for research paradigms that will allow for the issues to be studied rigorously but in natural social contexts.

Theme 3

INDIVIDUAL, SOCIAL AND STRUCTURAL FACTORS IN LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND RESTORATION IN CANADA

The maintenance and restoration of language is a matter of vital concern in Canada. Our great variety of language groups, comprising the two founding groups, the native groups and the immigrant groups, together with our rejection of the melting-pot approach to language and culture, creates special circumstances in Canada which put a premium on knowledge about how languages and cultures are maintained.

In general terms, the concern is with the antecedents of language maintenance; what are the factors which are correlated with language survival or demise? At the level of the individual, the focus is on attitudes and values; at the societal level, it is the influence of social norms and roles, family, and reference groups; at the institutional level, it is the impact of school, mass media, church, work-setting, and government.

From the scientific-point-of-view, information about these processes will contribute significantly to our appreciation of the nature of man; from the socio-political point of view, such information is critical, not just for the implementation of social policies, but for the formulation of policies.

Dr. Driedger, who was commissioned to review what research has been done in connection with this theme, approaches it from three perspectives. At one level, he focusses on what he calls a macro-perspective of the social system which is Canada, in an attempt to bring some order to the complex historical, demographic, political and economic factors from which the social structure of Canada has evolved. At another level, he discusses smaller units of social interaction, of which the prototype is the ethnic enclave, and the roles of territorial control, social institutions, ethnic culture and social

distance in the maintenance of these smaller social units. And, at a third level, he concerns himself with analysis of factors within the individual, such as aspirations, attitudes, values, symbols, norms, roles and reference-groups, which bear on language maintenance.

In his original and highly provocative paper, he reviews the research which has been done in the area and, in the process, makes it clear that what has been done merely scratches the surface of what needs to be done. He attributes some of our backwardness to the fact that we have been less able to make use of American research endeavours than is usually the case. American research of the past fifty years, he points out, has been preoccupied with study of the assimilation of minorities with consequent neglect of groups which retained separate identities; a separateness which constitutes such an important element in the Canadian cultural mosaic, has been regarded as a relatively insignificant factor in the American pattern of minority-majority relations. Of the research which has been done in Canada, much has centred on the needs of the two charter-language groups. Very little is available on the language needs of the minority groups and even less is available on how minorities can maintain their language and culture. Dreidger views this as being an undesirable state of affairs, since, he argues, that what may be important to study in one region of the country may not be in another. Similarly, multiculturalism may be a viable option in some regions but not others. Another serious impediment to research is that instruments, indices and scales are very much underdeveloped and theories which grow out of the Canadian context have hardly been formulated. There exists a crying need for the development of more precise measures of degree of ethnic identification, of social distance and of prejudice toward the use of specific languages. For example, attitudes to languages such as English, French, and minority languages need to be explored. We need to know if a particular language conjures up stereo-

types, and if so, of what nature. In similar vein, Dreidger reminds us that while, at the moment, it seems clear that language usage is associated very closely with other ethnic cultural factors, more study is needed to find out whether or not language use is the most important factor in the preservation of ethnic identity. However, we lack both theory and the methods for tackling these issues with any degree of precision.

Generally, Dreidger's review of what has been done to date constitutes a vademecum of research which is desperately in need of being done, interspersed with tantalizing flashes of what has been done. His final paragraph epitomizes the state of knowledge in this area:

"Very little research related to ethnic self-identification in Canada has been done. Is language indeed the gatekeeper to a distinct culture, or is religious ideology more important? What symbolic value do Canadians place on English, French, and other languages? Will a language remain dynamic and be maintained only if the culture is dynamic? How can languages remain alive, and to what extent are they permitted to change and still maintain themselves? Are historical symbols more important than language as a symbol system? Why is it important to maintain a distinctive language? Because of its own intrinsic worth or because of the access it provides to a distinctive culture? Do social status and language status go hand in hand, and can a language be maintained only if in-group status remains high? Is it really true that when language is lost, the identity of the group is lost? What are the exceptions and the alternatives? These are but a few of the questions awaiting research."

Dr. Pierre Laporte, in his role as a Discussant of Driedger's paper, was very favourably impressed with Driedger's assumption that language and cultural policy should be based on the linguistic and cultural characteristics of regions, rather than on abstract ideas such as that of charter group equality upon which the present policy is based. He sees this as formulating national policy in terms of the concrete realities of linguistic and cultural regions as they are, rather than what it is wished they would be. A consequence of Driedger's regionalization of language and cultural policy, would be that the national policy would be highly diversified but much more viable both in Quebec and in other parts of Canada. In support of this view, he argues that the current policy of bilingualism is unjust, elitist, and "based on a fantasmagoric image of what the country should become linguistically."

* Dr. Samarin, the other Discussant, was concerned that our concern for the study of the Canadian situation not blind us to the desirability of developing a universal theory of minority relations. He stressed that the consequences of language contact in Canada are universal and urged that we view the patterns of Canadian language contact in cross-cultural perspective: "While one eye examines local phenomena, the other retains the image of what is reported to have happened in New Guinea, Morocco, or Asia Minor". He went on to argue that it is premature to grasp after theories for the study of language maintenance and cited that fact as one reason why the Canadian situation should be researched.

He took Driedger (and others, including the Consultative Group) to task for failing to adequately define terms such as multi-cultural, uni-lingual, mono-cultural, arguing that, "The symmetry of prefixation creates categories that are more fanciful than they are real." In the same vein, he warned against the ready acceptance of some of the ad hoc generalizations which had

been made at the Conference. As an example, he took Driedger's statements that "multilingualism may be impractical in an urban society" and "it seems increasingly more difficult to maintain the boundaries of the minority ethnos of the urban environment". To illustrate the dangers of such generalizations he described several exceptions." In India, ethnic groups have maintained their languages many centuries after migration to a linguistically very diverse area. Russian Molokan sectarians have retained their language in the heart of Los Angeles after seventy years whereas other Russian-speaking sectarians (viz., New Israelites) are almost entirely Spanish speaking in rural Uruguay (Colonia de Russo or Colonia de San Javier) even after founding a completely Russian village."

In putting these forceful arguments, Samarin made it clear that his intent was to urge greater research effort rather than to denigrate the search for conceptual models for the study of language maintenance and shift.

In the discussions which followed the formal papers, the over-balance in the direction of French-English relationships was again noted (although with less justification with respect to the cited research on this theme than with others), and it was suggested that more generalizable findings might be obtained by studies designed, for example, to study language maintenance in a French enclave in P.E.I. or, especially, the maintenance of Chinese in Vancouver.

It was noted that, although the theme called for consideration of language restoration, restoration was not dealt with by any of the panel members, despite the fact that, in some regions of Canada, restoration is of major significance and research is badly needed. For example, it was proposed that for some young Cree, restoration of language is an important element in attaining self-identity.

And finally, the available Canadian data on language maintenance were

criticized also. It was argued that, apart from the French and Jewish research, Canadian studies had, so far, been fragmented, folkloric, largely descriptive rather than analytical, and of very uneven quality.

In all, the group welcomed the Driedger framework as a fresh way of looking at and generating research questions, but itself needing much research in the way of validation.

Theme 4

FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGES IN CANADA

The Consultative Group's intent with this theme was to go beyond the basic function of language as a vehicle for communicating ideas, thoughts and feelings, and to focus on it as a social phenomenon. How does language function as a cue to ethnic identity and social status? What is the social significance of a bilingual's use of his different languages in the home, in public, in intimate relations? How does language use serve as a means of accommodation or of indirectly communicating social distance?

Dr. John Jackson, who accepted the task of reviewing the work which has been done in this area, deals with language as a symbol of membership in social categories and collectivities and the viability of a language as a symbol of the viability of such human groups. He notes that the acquisition of such functions by languages is historically specific and emerges from political-economic processes. He summarizes his position as follows:

As a means to probe the functions of language beyond that of communication, I have proposed two axes of analysis: a collective-individual axis and a macro-micro-axis. At the macro-individual level, language functions as a symbol of membership in social categories or collectivities. Language is the colour of membership. People are classified by others and so classify themselves according to "dominant language" spoken. The process through which language assumes such a function and the status implications of belonging to one or another linguistic category is historically specific. This process

can only be examined at a collective level of analysis.

At the macro-collective level, ethnic consciousness does not become socially meaningful until people come into contact with each other in economic and/or political superordinate-subordinate relationships. Contact and communication between peoples is an obvious prerequisite. With respect to the Canadian situation, two types of contract situations were proposed. An indigenous-subordinate, migrant-dominant type best describes relations between Europeans and Ameridians, and between French and English. An indigenous dominant, migrant subordinate best describes the relations between immigrant populations and the "charter member minorities." There are some exceptions to this latter statement. The consequences for the subsequent social organization of the relationships between the interacting groups vary according to type of contact. It was suggested that the concepts generally applied to "minority groups" are more appropriate to the second type, less so to the first type. Moreover, native and immigrant political and related language issues are played out within the context of French-English relations and the first type of contact situation.

Language may or may not be associated with ethnic consciousness. If it is, the issue of its importance relative to other cultural or biological characteristics which historically become associated with collections of people is an empirical question. What is important to Canada, where language has become so associated, is that it is the focus of political and economic conflict between subordinate and superordinate social categories and collectivities. At the individual level, language is thus readily associated with status and language maintenance and enforcement as a status threat. At the collective level, language maintenance and enforcement serves as a boundary maintenance device.

Collectivities so created develop organizational capacities for action around ethnic consciousness and language maintenance. This organizational activity links the macro- with the micro-collective level. It is here, at the micro- or community level, the the concrete day to day interaction of people within this system may be explored. It is through an organizational life built around an ethnic consciousness that the concept of "domains" becomes relevant insofar as it relates specific language choices made by people in daily interaction to institutions and spheres of

activity. Questions regarding the use of a language as a means of indicating to the other exclusion or inclusion, acceptance or rejection, and the personal meaning of losing or acquiring a language, link the micro-collective with the micro-individual level. At this level, identity and self-concept are the key concepts. It was suggested that a person's conception of himself is fluid, subject to changes at the collective level. Ethnic consciousness and the associated language will or will not assume a core position in the self-concept according to events at other levels. It probably assumes a more peripheral position among bilinguals than among unilinguals. A bilingual may become unilingual as his self-concept is changed to meet changing definitions of the situation at the macro-level.

In their papers, the Discussants, Dr. Raymond Breton and Dr. Frances Aboud, put forward a number of suggestions for filling in and extending Dr. Jackson's model, and these were added to and refined during the various discussions among the delegates to the Conference. While it is not possible to explicate all of them here, outlining some of them may serve to convey the flavour of the discussion.

Breton suggested that variations in the extent and mode of linguistic control, of accommodations, training provisions and exceptions, constitute an important area of study. He pointed out that the language that prevails in an institution (or any form of social relationship) provides a good clue about which

linguistic group controls that institution. Control can be more or less extensive, with a variety of accommodations and exceptions being made, and it is these variations in the form of control which offer a rich field for research. An extension of this type of research could profitably focus on the ideologies developed for the legitimization of a particular pattern of linguistic stratification in a society as a whole, in a certain institutional domain, or in specific organizations.

Breton warned too, against the common assumption that language is a unitary variable and urged the study of varieties of language. All the varieties of English and French, for example, do not have the same social value, either from an instrumental or a social status point-of-view. Linguistic differentiation exists within language collectivities and such differentiation is related to the internal distribution of power and status and should be studied. For example, is it possible that part of the lower level of school performance by lower class children is due to inadequate socialization in the linguistic patterns and styles that predominate in that institutional context? Is it possible, he asks, that boundaries between social classes are partly maintained through differential linguistic socialization? A similar form of analysis could profitably be applied to study the linguistic basis of differential rates of male and female social and institutional participation, or to the relationship between the particular variety of language immigrants are socialized into and the particular place they come to occupy in the absorbing social structure.

Aboud directed much of her paper to examining the micro-individual aspects of language, especially those concerned with the effects that self-identity and other psychological processes have on sociological variables. She argues, for instance, that, although language functions as a marker of group membership,

judgements of status are not the only, or necessarily even the most important, consequences of this recognition. In addition, she questions the claim that language defines group membership and provides evidence that information about an individual's place of origin, occupation, sex or personality are also used by the individual himself, and by others to define that individual's group membership. As a concrete example of this line of thought, she proposes study of the identity loss of adults who cease to use their mother tongue, with that of young children who are still in the process of defining themselves.

She stresses, also, the importance of looking at language use in contexts other than politics and the economy, viz., family, friends, or community groups.

In discussing how individuals use others to establish and evaluate their positions in the social matrix, Aboud reminds us that the process is not as simple as is sometimes thought. A person's self-concept consists of many facets relating to the wide variety of roles that that person may engage in. The development of an individual's social identity is an interaction which is contingent on the relative importance of the different facets or roles in the individual's self-concept and his conception of other (out) groups in relation to his own. At any point in time (but especially during times of stress), the facet of social identity which is in question, be it sex-role, ethnicity, or language, will determine which out-group will be salient for contrastive comparisons. Thorough understanding of identity insecurity thus requires that it be studied in relation to the processes of group differentiation and group comparison.

During the discussion periods at the Conference, a number of other important points emerged. It was generally conceded that Canadian psychologists had done interesting work on the function of language and social identity and that this was a fruitful area for further study. Some delegates suggested

that future work should be more cognizant of linguistic analyses. Others thought that we need more detail on how language extends to more than the identification of status, and why and how language becomes a salient identifying feature. A related matter, about which we require much more information, is the fluidity of identity over time and what sort of markers become important at certain times. Another, more general, suggestion was that we need more studies that combine research in laboratory situations with research in natural settings, using techniques of informal interviews and participant observation, in order to bridge the gap between micro-and macro-levels of analysis. Another profitable area of research is work situations in which language is used differentially as a resource, and assessments are made about the differential rewards meted out for this or that kind of language. And, one other suggestion which should be mentioned, is that we seek examples of reverse assimilation with the expectation that the dynamics of this phenomenon would add to our understanding of the variables bearing on language use.

Social Factors in Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism

Theme 5

The issue of bilingualism is fundamental to Canadian society. As such it is not a topic which has been limited to the interest of social sciences nor indeed to the scientific community at large. The challenge for the committee was to articulate the issue in such a way that it was consistent with the basic focus of the individual, language and society. Thus some of the purely linguistic developments in bilingualism, the effects of bilingualism on cognitive functioning and issues surrounding native language acquisition were not considered. However, some of these issues were raised in the discussion of the commissioned papers since they are relevant to understanding the social factors in bilingualism.

Several specific questions emerged, from discussions within the committee and from reviewing the responses to the questionnaires, as central to the present theme which permitted some focus to the commissioned papers for this topic. The fundamental topic was the social conditions which facilitate or hinder second language learning. Beyond this, more specific issues included attitudes toward becoming bilingual, factors affecting the motivation for second language learning and the role of social structures such as the school, work and the natural street environment for second language learning.

Professor Gardner who was commissioned to prepare the central paper for the theme and Professors Neufeld and Swain who prepared the discussant papers all appeared to successfully capture the essence of the topic circumscribed by the committee. Gardner's paper, accompanied by an annotated bibliography, presented a thorough and detailed but imaginative assessment of

research on this theme. Clearly Neufeld and Swain appreciated the scope of the paper although each had an important and unique contribution to make in completing the overall picture on this theme. Specifically, Gardner considered four major areas in his paper:

- 1) Social factors which influence second language acquisition
- 2) Individual differences in second language acquisition
- 3) Factors affecting attitudes and motivation
- 4) Costs and benefits of second language acquisition

As Gardner explains "The four areas are discussed in this order because this would appear to provide a meaningful transition from largely sociological and environmental variables as they influence the acquisition of a second language (Area 1) to those individual difference variables which appear to influence how well second languages are acquired (Area 2). Since, a major class of individual difference variables of importance in second language acquisition appears to be of an attitudinal/motivational nature, it seems most reasonable to then move on to consider those factors which appear to influence this class of variables (Area 3). Finally, having considered those aspects which influence second language acquisition, it seems reasonable to consider briefly those characteristics of the individual which might be influenced by the acquisition of a second language (Area 4).

The issue of bilingualism as defined in terms of the present theme is of interest to all the social sciences and has relevance to at least three important segments of Canadian society. These include bilingualism involving French and English, bilingualism from the point of view of new Canadians which would involve a native language and either French or English and in some

cases both, and bilingualism, or multiculturalism, among native peoples where a variety of mother tongues as well as the charter languages may be involved.

Despite the importance of all these areas of bilingualism, and their need to be examined from a variety of perspectives, certain areas and disciplines have dominated previous interest and work in this field.

Specifically, psychologists have been most active in conducting research on the social factors in second language acquisition. This conclusion is derived not only from the prepared papers on the theme but from discussions of the theme at the conference and from the responses to the questionnaires. This domination of the field by psychologists has important theoretical and practical implications. First, theoretical issues in this area have been articulated with/a psychological framework. As such, it is not sufficient merely to recommend an increased input from disciplines such as anthropology, sociology and linguistics. It will be necessary to restate the issues in broader terms or else run the risk of ultimately gaining only a limited understanding of the issue.

Second, the psychological emphasis has affected the research strategy. Cross-sectional, large sample studies conducted in the structured environment of the classroom or laboratory exemplify the approach in this area. Lacking are the longitudinal case study approaches which can complement the method of psychology.

Third, the strong psychological bias has precluded the possibility for extensive multi- or inter-disciplinary research. However, unlike in other areas, it is not the case for the present theme that disciplines are competing

for claim over the area. Hence it may be reasonable to anticipate co-operation among various social science disciplines in the future.

Although the present theme is of central importance for all Canadians, research has focussed almost exclusively on the acquisition of French or English. There is of course a sound historical basis for explaining this emphasis, however there are at least two important reasons why bilingualism must be defined here in its broadest sense as a focus on competence in two languages. First, while the French and English languages remain the most salient feature of Canadian society, bilingualism involving other non-charter languages has become an issue of central importance since the formal adoption in 1971 of a multiculturalism policy in Canada. Further, the increased use of indigenous languages among native peoples raises important questions about second language acquisition which have not received sufficient attention.

Second, the social factors affecting second language acquisition are obviously complex and dynamic. Hence an understanding of the issues in any one segment of society requires research in as many and as varied social contexts as possible. Broadening the base of research to include all forms of bilingualism can only lead to a fuller understanding of the more general processes themselves.

To summarize in terms of the state of the field, the integrated and detailed paper prepared by Professor Gardner confirms what the results of the questionnaires suggested. There are several very active researchers in the field, coherent theories are beginning to emerge and the collective body of research appears to have direction to it. Equally clear are the limitations

and omissions to research on the social factors affecting second language learning. These include the central role played by psychologists in this field and the emphasis on French and English to the exclusion of research on other world and indigenous languages which are central to Canadian society.

Information from the prepared papers and the ensuing discussions converge to suggest appropriate directions for the future. These recommendations focus on "who" should guide the research, appropriate "settings" for research and the "substantive issues" which might be addressed. From the earlier discussion it is clear that there is a need for input from a wider variety of social science disciplines. Because of the prominence of psychologists in this area there was a consensus that the more "macro" approach that has characterized previous research should be complemented by more "micro" approaches, and indeed a strong case was made by Neufeld for "case studies of individuals learning in uncontrived settings". The risk to acting upon such a suggestion is that this new research emphasis might be conducted in parallel with the more macro approaches. This would be undesirable, and instead interdisciplinary research is needed which integrates the two approaches so that theory and research can progress rather than move in parallel.

Two recommendations emerged in terms of appropriate settings for future research. Following from our earlier discussion there is a clear need for research which focuses on the bilingualism of Canadians of other than British or French heritage. Beyond this, several scholars expressed the need for research in more natural settings. Specifically, it was noted that most research to date had been conducted within the context of formal second language programs in primary and secondary schools. Given that children acquire

much of their native language skill before school age, and given also the limited success of traditional second language programs, it would seem important to pursue other avenues. However, there is little research to date which examines the conditions conducive to second language learning outside of the school setting.

Finally, a number of substantive issues were raised as important avenues for further research. Presented below are a list of what emerge as eleven important questions to be addressed given our present state of knowledge. The first nine are those articulated specifically by Gardner and these are followed by specific additions suggested by Neufeld and Swain in their papers. Together these questions cover the range of suggestions which emerged from discussion sessions at the conference although some were reinforced more than others.

1. What role is played by social factors such as level of bilingualism, political climate, social class, etc... in the acquisition of a second language?
2. What are the dynamics involved in the "street learning" of a second language? Is street learning more efficient than formal school learning? In what ways? Why?
3. What are the attitudinal/motivational parameters involved in bilingual development in young as compared with older persons?
4. Are there personality correlates of second language achievement? What dynamics would underlie such relationships?

5. Given that attitudes and motivation are related to the acquisition of a second language, what are the processes which account for this relationship?
6. In what ways do social factors influence attitudes and motivation with respect to the acquisition of a second language?
7. What influence can various intervention programs designed to modify attitudinal/motivational characteristics have on students of a second language?
8. To what extent can curricular innovations promote greater levels of second language achievement? Are Immersion programs the only answer? Are they an answer?
9. How can studies be designed to study the individual costs and benefits of bilingualism isolating the effects of bilingualism from social factors which tend to be associated with bilingualism?
10. What can we learn about bilingualism from the study of native language acquisition?
11. What are the specific skills involved in bilingualism?
How do various social variables relate to these specific skills?

What emerges from these questions is a need to understand rather than merely describe the social factors involved in bilingualism. Gardner's paper expresses this need most clearly. "Underlying many of these questions there seems to be one basic theme, viz. What is the process (or processes) operating in the acquisition of a second language and the development of a bilingual

individual? Such a basic question seems to call for an underlying theoretical model which is able to integrate all the factors operating in the acquisition of a second language".

Theme 6

Institutional and Individual Bilingualism in Canada

For this theme, one of crucial practical importance in Canada, the Consultative Committee formulated the following set of questions to suggest the lines along which the major paper and discussions on it might proceed:

"The concern here is with the different social implications of institutional bilingualism as opposed to individual bilingualism. What are the implications of an institutional bilingualism in which members of two language groups are not bilingual but can deal with institutions in their own language? How does that kind of bilingualism contrast with a situation in which all members of the two groups are bilingual so that institutional bilingualism is not necessary? What are the results of a situation in which these two forms of bilingualism are combined? How does reciprocal vs. non-reciprocal bilingualism function and what are their effects on behaviour? In which situation will the two language groups thrive? Under what circumstances can inter-group conflict be expected?"

The Consultative Committee asked Dr. Pierre E. Coulombe to present the major paper on this theme. A sociologist, Dr. Coulombe has much experience in research on language matters and is one of the key officials responsible

for the implementation of the Official Languages Act in the public service of Canada. For him the questions raised are of more than scholarly import; they are real-life issues which he confronts every day. The greater part of his paper understandably draws on information from the massive experiment in language change undertaken by the public service of Canada, although he is certainly aware that other settings also qualify for inclusion in discussion of institutional bilingualism. For example he cites the case of University of Ottawa where he taught for a number of years.

In his paper, Coulombe outlines the steps in the development of language policy and programmes in the public service of Canada from the inception of the Royal Commission of Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1963 to the stage reached in 1975. He also presents tabular data on the changes in linguistic composition of the public service work force by sector and employment category for 16 regions in Canada.

Coulombe argues strongly that institutional bilingualism and individual bilingualism, which tend to be regarded as in opposition, are intimately linked with one another. In illustrating this relationship with examples from the public service, Coulombe conveys something of the complexity of the task of changing language habits of long standing. This task involves a network of interrelated programs: for example, the setting up of bilingual units to complement unilingual English and French units; courses for varying levels of language acquisition; the provision of translation services. These and other interrelated programs are to achieve the goals of language change without penalizing those who are not officially bilingual and without perpetuating the situation in which it is the Francophones who bear the heaviest language load in bilingual institutions.

Coulombe draws attention to the fact that this massive transformation in language usage is not occurring in a static structure; it goes on amid continuous organizational change in other aspects of the public service, many of them unpredictable.

With respect to research, Coulombe points out that the experience with implementing changes in language policy provides a rich source of information from which hypotheses could be generated and tested. However, the persons responsible for implementation get little help from the social science research community. One reason for this is that findings and the recommendations based on them are usually stated in such a way as to be difficult to apply in concrete situations. Many social scientists lack a 'grounded' perspective and fail to take into account the constraints and imponderables confronting those who are supposed to act on their recommendations.

In his commentary on Dr. Coulombe's paper, Professor Jaroslav Bohdan Rudnyckyj agreed that more research was needed on the relationship between individual and institutional bilingualism. However, he devoted most of his commentary to the application of bilingual policies and programs in situations other than the Federal public service. The highlight of his presentation was the setting out of alternative models of individual and institutional bilingualism which could be adapted to organizations at local, regional, and Provincial levels and for language groups other than English and French. These 'other' languages he categorized together as 'Altrophone', a label of his own invention.

Professor John Meisel's commentary is rich in ideas for research on institutional bilingualism. Many of his suggestions could be immediately translated into concrete research proposals on the topic. He gives support to Coulombe's plea to researchers to take advantage of the many on-going experiments in language change, noting that these lend themselves to a before-during-after type of research design and to the comparison of control and experimental groups. Meisel also advocates broadening the institutional bilingualism research field by including non-governmental groupings, such as schools and voluntary organizations. He also outlined several research ideas on the effects of language transformation both on the individuals and the community settings, such as the National Capital region.

Perhaps the major contribution of Meisel's commentary follows from his questioning of Coulombe's point that a substantial amount of personal or individual bilingualism is a prerequisite for institutional bilingualism. In questioning this point, Meisel puts issues of language policy for institutions into a broader context of political ideology and formulae. With reference to concerns expressed over the establishment of unilingual units in the public service, he suggests that the desire to foster both personal and institutional bilingualism is inspired by a North American pluralist ideology which abhors the segregation of ethnic and language groups. An alternative ideology, that of consociational democracy, is gaining support in Canada, at least among scholars who have studied European countries which have had to accommodate ethnic and language cleavages.

To the many ideas and proposals for research advanced in the commissioned papers by Coulombe, Rudnyckyj and Meisel, the Conference participants added a

number of questions, some of which could be translated into researchable terms. Three types of concern provide headings for the many questions raised: relations between individuals and institutions with respect to language change; problems of institutional change, as such; and the integration of research enterprises with one another as well as with issues of language policy.

On the relationship between institutional and individual bilingualism, the following questions are typical of the many which were put up for discussion: what amount of individual bilingualism (and what levels) and what is the critical mass of unilinguals required to maintain particular bilingual institutions? What are the problems and prospects of behavioural modification in bilingual and unilingual units? What do we know of the language behaviour of people (e.g., public servants) within bilingual institutions?

Following the lead of Dr. Coulombe and overlapping with theme five on language acquisition, questions were raised about how language learning relates to institutional bilingualism. Too little is known on the functional language training required in large scale implementation programs. An assumption of the public service program is that the vast majority of the adult population can learn a second language. Is this a valid assumption? Too little is known on the training of adult populations associated with the 'real world' requirements of the job to be performed as opposed to teaching the second language with self contained methods which do not fit the practical needs of the organizations.

It was agreed that it is necessary to study the effects of a setting of institutional bilingualism on the linguistic and other aspects of individual

behaviour. Do the new kinds of units set up in the public service create linguistic and psychological barriers for interaction between individuals? What are the unintended effects of institutional changes in language practices on behaviour, is there evidence of backlash, feelings of deprivation, approval or disapproval?

In the discussions some advocated giving priority to changing personal attitudes and motives in order to bring about social change; others argued that structural change in the laws and in institutional arrangements should take priority, that individual change would follow. What has the social scientist to offer in dealing with such fundamental questions?

It was pointed out by discussants that the relationships between individuals would vary considerably according to the kind of bilingual institution. As examples there are various kinds of Crown Corporations, voluntary organizations like churches and clubs; schools and universities; the armed forces, and others. Apart from these different domains, there are institutional variations according to language composition. For instance, there is the type where all or most of the participants are bilingual; the type where few participants are bilingual, the great majority being unilingual, the bilingual persons linking the two unilingual segments. It was noted that there appears to be a trend toward the segmented or parallel type of institutions in Canada, where, for example, unilingual schools replace bilingual ones in certain Ontario and New Brunswick communities. One reason for this, it was suggested, was the French fear that bilingual institutions provide an assimilative environment for their children. An interesting question is, to what extent do certain bilingual institutions contribute to the assimilation

of individuals?

On the topic of institutional change, as such, there was some discussion on the societal conditions under which it was likely to be effective. What can we learn from the experiences in other countries, such as Belgium and Finland? Do we have enough information on attempts at institutional change in different Canadian settings to permit comparison of factors which foster and impede the process?

Some participants thought that we had enough Canadian experience with language change in institutions to launch research on some of the effects of this change. For instance, what happens to institutions or units within them which change from unilingual to bilingual or from bilingual to unilingual? What are the effects on attitudes and language behaviour in designated bilingual districts where the Official Languages Act has been implemented? Is there a heightening of conflict or is there accommodation?

As for more general considerations about the research enterprise, a number of points were made in the discussions, some of which overlapped with points in Theme Eight. One is that research on institutional bilingualism should be carried out in the context of the growing literature from many parts of the world on language planning and policy. Another point had to do with the pressing need for the integration of research efforts and findings. Individual fragments of research, no matter how high the quality, are not very useful to those responsible for implementing policies and programs. There is not enough interaction and collaboration between independent researchers, most of whom are funded by the Canada Council, and government researchers on studies that have a direct bearing on important policy issues.

Theme 7

LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND COGNITION IN CANADA

A long-standing concern of social scientists, of a variety of disciplines, has been the relationship of culture to cognition, and how these variables influence, or are influenced by, language. How are cultural and cognitive differences reflected in language in ways that make communication with other groups more or less difficult? How does learning two, or more, languages influence cognition? Is there a danger that learning a second language may not facilitate better communication because of differences in the cognitive systems underlying the two languages? Do different languages facilitate different kinds of cognitive activity? And what is the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence? These are the kinds of questions which the Consultative Group posed to Dr. J. W. Berry, when asking him to prepare a review paper for presentation at the Conference.

In his paper, Dr. Berry examined specifically the differential cultural features of these language-cognition relationships in the bicultural and multicultural context of Canada. For the purpose of his review the relevant literature on cognitive phenomena, was categorized in terms of: a) process and structure; b) skills and performance; and c) capacity and competence. Within this framework, the available materials were reviewed, usually with linguistic and cultural variables treated as antecedent, and cognitive phenomena considered as consequent.

Berry's paper presents a strong and clear orientation to this difficult topic, which engendered some equally strong divergence of opinion at the Conference. For example, one conclusion with important implications for future research is that, contrary to the generalizations of early psychologists, anthropologists and some linguists, language-related or culture-related variations in basic cognitive processes or structures are virtually

non-existent.

In opening his review, Berry presents some discussion of the universal and relative positions in social science, suggesting that these opposing views are, to a large extent, a matter of emphasis; any comparison across languages or cultures requires some underlying commonality, but would not be worth doing without some variations. The essential task is to evaluate the balance between universal and relative components of the variation, a process which necessitates specification of the variables to be considered.

He points out that research design and findings on language, culture and cognition in Canada, where various cultural groups have tended to retain their viability but within one set of political norms, may differ from those in settings where cultural groups are highly contrasting, or in settings in which cultural groups tend to be assimilated by one dominant culture. The bulk of the general literature, he reminds us, is based on studies in contexts which differ from the Canadian one in important respects. We must take seriously the possibility that research conceived and conducted elsewhere, may not have large scientific or applied relevance in Canada.

The Canadian research, he argues, indicates that our language and culture groups often may differ in skills/performance and sometimes in capacity/competence, but there is little evidence of differences in process/structure. He calls the first two "surface" differences, and the latter "deep" or fundamental similarities. Because of the importance of group interaction in Canada, the review goes beyond psychometric and experimental psychology, to deal with intergroup relations and social cognition. Berry's concern stems from his claim that language- or culture-related variations in basic cognitive processes are virtually non-

existent, and are therefore unlikely to be responsible for any variation in social cognition or for difficulties in intergroup communication. And yet there is clear evidence for differential intergroup beliefs, stereotypes and communication among various language-cultural groups in Canada. From this pair of observations, he concludes that, if our primary interest lies in discovering those cognitive behaviours associated with intergroup relations in Canada, then our research effort should be devoted to the socio-cultural context of the interaction, rather than to basic cognitive processes. If, on the other hand, our interest lies in comprehending such basic processes (especially their relationship to the bilingualism which is so much a part of our sociocultural context), then efforts in this direction are necessary. And, if our interest is in those cognitive behaviours which signal differences in the sociocultural context (e.g., beliefs, stereotypes, accents), then the cognitive performances (both language and other skills) should be examined to determine the role they play in intergroup perception and communication.

Included throughout Berry's paper are many suggestions of priorities for future research. For instance, in describing the research on relationships between culture and cognitive performance in Canada (which he judges to be well-advanced), he makes a plea for comparative studies of performance relationships and differences in sub-cultures. (In urging this as a research priority, he stresses that it is important that the work not proceed within an imported framework.) In addition, next to no work has been devoted to the study of cognitive features which are specifically characteristic of persons who live in two or more cultural traditions. And again, in the area of cognitive differences between bilingual and unilingual persons (another area of scholarship in which Canadian scholars have played a significant role),

he argues that the research effort must be continued because of the great scientific, educational, social and political implications it has for Canada. Studies which are designed to apply the emerging findings to both schools and other institutions might merit priority research support, he contends. A related problem-area, which is likely to be readily amenable to fruitful research, is that of the relationship of the concepts of additive and subtractive bilingualism to cognitive performance.

The discussants for Berry's paper, Drs. Metro Gulatson and Pauline Jones, viewed their papers as adding an expanded perspective, rather than as a direct evaluation of the main paper. Both suggest alternative models for future research (and for organizing past research) which can provide for more dynamic and oscillating features of language-culture-cognitive relationships, in order to tease out main and interaction effects among all three classes of variables. Gulatson questions Berry's interpretation that there is little evidence to suggest that basic process and structure differences in cognitive activity exist between single-language and bi-language users. Jones suggests more attention in the model to within group, as well as across group, differences, and suggests treating all three classes of variables as continuous. She also makes a number of proposals for expanding the perspective such as clearer definition of the dimensions of culture by means of factor analytic or similar procedures. And she reminds us that, explosive as the issues may be, the behavioural genetic approach will have to be added to the model.

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN CANADA: POLITICS AND PRACTICE

Theme 8

Although long practiced in Continental Europe, language planning and language policy have remained foreign to Canadian society, since its dominant British political tradition was founded on the primacy of individual rights over those of the group.

It is only since the past few decades that Canadians have come to grips with the problems created by scientific enquiry into such questions as language rights, language planning and language policy. It was not surprising that the questions facing our Group turned out to be such simple and basic ones, answers to which had been very long over-due. These included such questions as the following. What are the language policy alternatives open to Canadian society and what are the consequences that could be expected from each? To what extent can or should language policy differ from one region to the next? Can the use and usage of languages in Canada be the subjects of effective and applicable legislation? To what extent can each of the languages spoken in Canada be standardized according to Canadian usage and what are the implications of such standardization? Which Canadian Indian languages and Eskimo dialects should be standardized, and to what extent? What is the role of the mass media in Canadian

language standardization? Such were the question which our Group grouped under a single theme.

Definition and articulation of language policy and language planning, therefore, became a real challenge for the Consultative Group and for the two scholars who were commissioned to prepare the paper and the commentary. Both being in Alberta, they were understandably concerned with more than the problems raised by Canadian official bilingualism; both included multiculturalism as a major area of enquiry. It is also not surprising that Hobart (sociology) conceived the problems within a social context, while Darnell (anthropology) stressed the advantages of anthropological research techniques.

Hobart's paper supplies a useful survey of foreign sociolinguistic literature, since he has found nothing in the formal literature of sociolinguistics relevant to Canadian language policy.

On the politics of language change, little of significance in Canada was found, except a paper related to the New Brunswick Acadians (Leslie's), and this is analyzed and commented on in some detail.

The third section of Hobart's paper is a brief survey of language planning in a few selected countries. Here reference is made to the literature on immigrant and Amerindian groups in the United States and to the language problems of Norway. The research reviewed here seems to point to the ethnocentric character of most language groups. Hobart notes that in Canada there is a growing interest by ethnic groups---both native and immigrant---in the retention of their traditional tongues.

Fourthly, we have a substantial treatment of the three main areas of government involvement in language issues in Canadian society. These are: education, law and public administration. There is a review of the educational system of Quebec as opposed to that of other provinces. Reference is made to the research of the Parent Commission on Quebec education, the educational systems of the other provinces resembling one another sufficiently to be considered under a single category. Yet reference is made to the special problems of Manitoba, the Maritimes, and Ontario, each province tending to respond in its own way to the needs of its minorities.

For the sections on the language question of the courts and those related to public administration, Hobart uses as his main source a study (Sheppard's) commissioned by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism on the language laws of Canada. Here we are left with the impression that the search for clear directives on language jurisdiction in Canada has led to a constitutional vacuum and that the confusion created by recent legislation is in part due to the ambiguity of key terms.

It is not surprising that so much of Hobart's paper is devoted to the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and to the impact which it has had on research in the area of language policy. Like most royal commissions---and to a greater extent than most---this one seeded a whole generation of research in the areas of its concern. It also recommended statutory bodies, like the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board, the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, and the Directorate

of Official Languages which, in conformity with the *Official Languages Act*, generated further enquiry. Hobart properly refers to the importance of these government bodies.

Also productive in generating research in this area was the Commission on the status of the French language in Quebec, the recommendations of which resulted in the enactment of legislation creating permanent research establishments in the field of language planning and the area of policy implementation. Nor does Hobart neglect the regional importance of the official languages act of New Brunswick, creating as it did an officially bilingual province, with equal status for English and French.

A section on language attitudes and practices in Canada concludes the review of the literature. This section includes comments on the survey of ethnic language familiarity (O'Brian, et al) and the attitudes affecting the retention of non-official languages and the fate of immigrant and native children in the schools of each province, noting the continuing shortage of qualified teachers and appropriate materials.

From the review of the literature it has become evident that the bulk of the research on language planning in Canada has been generated by government and government commissions and by official bodies and institutions created through federal and provincial language legislation.

In discussing the literature, Hobart comes out strongly in favour of expanding research on multiculturalism. He notes a liberalization of interethnic attitudes in Canada during the past decade.

In conclusion, Hobart proposes an immigration policy based on language maintenance. This would include cultural exchange programmes with countries whose language in Canada is endangered. He also suggests the adoption of the concept and status of regional official languages,

as was proposed by Rudnyckyj in the minority statement of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

In her comments on the paper, Darnell focusses on the theoretical and methodological aspects of the topic. Her main concern is with the evolution of a theory of language planning, expressed as a result of a continual interaction between policy and practice.

She does not believe that any theory should tell its adherents how it should be applied in changing situations. Social policy should not come from social scientists and their aprioristic models, but from the "grass roots of Canadian society." According to Darnell, what is most needed in this context is a scholarship of commitment..

Darnell regards research in this area as the successive working out of "scientific paradigms" each becoming obsolete once it has been exhausted. Since Canadian society is continually evolving, what is needed is a dynamic model made up of successive paradigms, also evolving in time. The first paradigm would relate to the pacification of ethnic groups the second to the elaboration of a pluralistic and multicultural society, the third being reserved for future situations, as yet unknown. The model is presented as three concentric circles. The facts needed to nourish these paradigms include the language and culture variables separating different ethnic groups such as the British, the French, the immigrants, the native peoples and the newcomers from the Third World now constituting a separate force in Canada.

Although Hobart and other social scientists may regard Canada as a pluralistic society, Darnell points out that the goal of the ethnic groups is not pluralism but varying degrees of ethnocentrism. And

although respect for different ethnicities is necessary for the survival of pluralism, this requisite of tolerance cannot be legislated.

The optimism of Hobart, therefore, does not seem to be shared by Darnell who would have expected by now a far greater degree of scholarly and political interest in this area of enquiry. She is not surprised by Hobart's contention that selective immigration policy has never been applied to the problems of language retention. It is significant to her, as it is to Hobart, that statements about multilingualism in Canada have so often seemed unrealistic. If so, and if language is the main indicator of culture, Canadian multiculturalism cannot be as real as it is imagined. Darnell agrees nonetheless that federal government concern for education in other languages is desirable and that, in addition to this, a model should be supplied for a plural Canadian society. Yet this model would have to account, not only for the immense social, attitudinal and cultural gaps between ethnic groups, but also the importance of these differences, both vertical and horizontal, within each one of these language minorities.

In the domain of ethnic attitudes, Darnell disagrees that people are always proud of their own language. She considers language standardization as a difficult and complex problem---especially when the standard is imposed from the outside; there are even ethnic groups devoid of fluency in any language.

In making recommendations for the future, the texts of both the main speaker and the commentator are particularly emphatic on need for planification for the survival of immigrant and native languages in the

context of a federal policy of multiculturalism. It would seem then, that what remains to be done, is something comparable to what has already been achieved in the promotion of the two official languages in all parts of the country.

The discussions based on these papers revealed the inherent conflicts in Canadian society on the politics of language and culture. On the one hand, a marked regional conflict was exposed as existing between the East and the West, particularly as it regards the dominance of the policies of bilingualism as opposed to the primacy of multiculturalism.

Other discussions were centred on the great amount of research within government bodies. There was a strong objection to the fact that most of the results of this research were either classified or they were found to be unavailable to the public, or to interested scholars. It was suggested that it would be in the interest of the governments concerned to open their in-house research projects to the criticism of the academic community.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The several sources of information which we now have at our disposal confirm the impression of the Development Committee that Canada is relatively weak in I.L. & S. studies. A proportionately small number of scholars make the Individual, Language and Society the main focus of their research; another small group have it as a peripheral research interest. Those for whom it is a major interest have been, in the main, highly productive of very cogent studies, which have earned them justifiable international recognition. Their work, however, is almost without exception intra-disciplinary in terms both of conception and execution, and researchers, sometimes of the same discipline, are often unaware of the works of others who are working with different language groups, or are using different but germane research methods.

Another important fact which emerges is that the bulk of the research which has been done has focussed on French-English contact in Canada and, in fact, almost exclusively in Quebec. French-English contact in the rest of Canada (where several important parameters differ significantly from the Quebec scene) has received relatively little attention, and the study of native groups and language groups other than French and English has been conspicuously underdeveloped. Quite apart from the needs of Canadian society for studies in these areas, this is a serious research weakness since the development of general laws requires that hypotheses be tested in a variety of situations with a variety of language and ethnic groups in a variety of relationships to each other.

Both the Symposium and the responses to the Questionnaires, refer to a host of questions and areas in urgent need of research. In fact, of the eight themes, only two appear to have received reassuring though still

inadequate research attention. With Theme 5, psychologists have been quite active and have made some highly important contributions to the research literature. However, as was pointed out earlier, a consequence of the almost exclusively psychological activity is that theoretical issues have been articulated within a psychological framework. Thus, what is needed is not only increased research by anthropologists, sociologists and linguists, but a restatement of the issues in broader, inter-disciplinary, terms. Some aspects of research on Theme 7 are reasonably well-advanced, particularly the work on relationships between culture and cognitive performance. However, next to no work has been devoted to the study of cognitive features which are specifically characteristic of persons who live in two or more cultural traditions, and the concepts of additive and subtractive bilingualism are in need of attention. Still, heartening progress has been made in this aspect of I.L. and S. research and it should be supplemented with studies designed to apply the emerging findings to both schools and other institutions.

On the whole, however, the 'state of the art' message comprises a long list of questions which must be studied before significant advances can be made in either theory or application. Canadian I.L. and S. scholars have many exciting opportunities open to them to make significant contributions.

Communication among Canadian Scholars

One of the major impediments to the development of a cohesive research programme in the area of the I.L. & S., is the lack of easy opportunity for interested scholars, from the variety of relevant disciplines, to learn who is active in the field and what they are doing. Typically, while Canadian scholars belong to their Canadian disciplinary associations, they look to American associations as their reference groups with respect to their work

in the area of the I.L. & S. Sometimes these are the broad disciplinary groups, e.g., American Psychological Association, which are large enough to accommodate specialities by providing a large audience of interested and active scholars. Alternatively, there exists in the United States a large number of specialty associations which offer access to an informed constituency of active scholars. These American associations are seductive to Canadian scholars, many of whom commonly attend the meetings of the American associations, and publish their results in the associations' journals. Not only does this enhance their opportunities for widespread recognition but it improves their chances for advancement in the Canadian universities in which they work. A scholar's Scientific Citation Index and Social Sciences Citation Index are being used increasingly in Canadian universities to decide salary and promotion questions.

The problem is compounded by the fact that so many Canadian Social Scientists have been trained in American universities. As graduate students, what problems they studied in their thesis research and where they studied them were usually pointed out to them by their thesis directors. Since many of them continue with their initial research interests upon completion of their graduate studies, it is not surprising that the data base to which they are attached is seldom Canadian, despite the fact that the very problems they study are widespread in Canada. They also become attached to invisible American colleges of like-minded colleagues with whom associations have been developed during their years in American graduate schools.

Thus, for a variety of reasons, American rather than Canadian forums are chosen by Canadian scholars for airing their research results. One serious consequence of this state of affairs is not only that Canadians tend to publish in American journals but they also look to the American literature

for their research inspiration. That research inspiration ordinarily does not focus on the types of situations which uniquely or nearly uniquely exist in Canadian society. Consequently, relatively few Canadian scholars exploit the rich research opportunities which abound in their own backyards. Canadian scholarship and Canadian society are the poorer for this fact.

A further difficulty is that, because of the numerous, large, ready-made constituencies in the U.S., members of Canadian scholarly disciplines are relatively badly informed about what their Canadian colleagues in other disciplines are doing, even though those colleagues are working on the same or similar problems. This situation was illustrated only too well by the National Planning Symposium on the Individual, Language and Society. The delegates to that Symposium were in the forefront of I.L. & S. research, yet a common theme throughout the four days was: "I didn't realize what members of your discipline were doing in my area". As one symposiast (a psychologist) put it: "I was made aware of research that was parallel (to my own) only in the sense that we were trying to explain or understand the same events - not parallel in the sense of duplication. Researchers trying to understand the same event were getting at it from different levels using different units of analysis. It was thus helpful to see where one's own research fit into the scheme and in what ways it appeared consistent or inconsistent with another level. Also, knowing what events were considered important at societal level has helped me formulate ways of testing their antecedents or consequences at a psychological level." It is critical that linguists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and others working in this area be aware of what their colleagues from other disciplines, with different techniques and different levels of analysis, are doing, if we are to advance the research frontiers as expeditiously as possible. To bridge this communications gap, it

is necessary to bring together members of the relevant disciplines in a common Canadian structure, with common meetings and a common publication outlet.

Strong arguments have often been mounted against the focus on Canadian research issues. It is contended that "good scholarship is international and knows no national boundaries." We accept that to be true. However, in our judgement, Canadian scholars will make their optimum contribution to international scholarship when they exploit the rich research opportunities so readily available to them in Canada (and often only in Canada). The alternative is to continue to direct the bulk of their efforts into the mainstream of "international" (predominantly American) research where their quantitatively small output creates scarcely a ripple. By diverting more of their energies to the uniquely Canadian scene, Canadian scholars could make substantial contributions to the understanding of man and, at the same time, to the solution of a number of the Nation's problems. It seems to us to be no accident that those Canadian scholars who have seized the opportunities available to them, have achieved international reputations by virtue of the unique data they bring to bear on international scholarly concerns.

Let it be clear that we are not advocating the closure of our border to scholarly publications. Much work done elsewhere bears directly and cogently on the Canadian research we are proposing, and it would be parochial in the extreme to ignore that work. What we are advocating is the more diligent use of our exciting research opportunities which should be supplemented and complemented by what is being done elsewhere.

The solution to the problem is to develop a structure which will foster easy communication among those Canadian scholars, of whatever discipline, concerned with the I.L. & S. The essential components of this structure are an organizational framework and a single publication outlet which is widely read by the international scholarly community. Not only will such a structure fos-

er more and better research which is informed about what is being done by Canadian scholars on Canadian problems, but it will provide Canadian teaching materials for both undergraduate and graduate courses.

If an organization of Canadian I. L. & S. scholars were to be established, its relatively small size could prove to be an asset since it would make it possible for scholars from a variety of disciplines to become familiar, often face-to-face, with each other's work. Such contact would facilitate the development of the highly desirable interdisciplinary orientations which seem most likely to be productive in I. L. & S. research.

Cross-Disciplinary Study

It is clear that the area of the I. L. & S. does not constitute a unified discipline, clearly defined by the training and disciplinary identification of its researchers. The Questionnaires and the Symposium reminded us again and again that the research specialization of a variety of disciplines is necessary for an effective attack on most of the problems in the area. Some argue that multidisciplinary research, i.e. research by teams of scholars from different disciplines with each contributing his special expertise to some common issue, is most likely to be productive. Others contend that even team research in which the researchers are all from the same discipline, is at best hazardous and to propose such an approach with team members of different disciplines is to invite calamity. It is argued that a disproportionate amount of energy is consumed in interdisciplinary squabbles which too often are settled (if they are settled at all) by the team's accepting the approach of its sociometric star, rather than by recourse to rational assessment of the techniques necessary to cope adequately with research problems.

We are impressed by the latter position. While we are quite prepared to acknowledge that some good research may be conducted efficaciously by some multi-disciplinary teams, those teams are most likely to comprise scholars

who are knowledgeable about the research interests and methods of the other disciplines represented on the team. It is our view that the most worthwhile research is likely to originate with individual scholars who are interdisciplinary in their orientations. In our lexicon, "interdisciplinary" refers to the kind of synthesis which is possible only by a single scholar who is versed in the ways of more than one discipline. However, whether team research, or individual scholarly enterprise, is deemed to be the preferred way of tackling the research problems of the area, it is highly desirable to develop a cadre of investigators with thorough knowledge of techniques derived from two or more disciplines, or who are familiar enough with the strengths and weaknesses of the other discipline to make effective cross-disciplinary collaboration possible.

To achieve the desirable broadening of backgrounds of scholars in the I.L. & S. area, a number of courses of action seems indicated. One of the most likely ways for a scholar to acquire thorough knowledge of another discipline, is to undergo intensive exposure, for an extended period of time, to the day-to-day activities of a research programme in that discipline. In effect, he becomes an apprentice within that programme (albeit a senior apprentice) who interacts daily with one or more researchers from another discipline. While his goal would be to educate himself, in all likelihood he also would be educating those with whom he is working, about his own discipline.

That type of interaction seems essential for the development of researchers with thorough cross-disciplinary knowledge.

For example, a linguist interested in the relationship between the patterns of language usage of bilingual persons and their social and ethnic correlates would be helped immensely by spending a period of time involved in the research of a sociologist or anthropologist engaged in studying interaction networks. In fact, that exposure might well make the difference

between his producing theoretically important results, rather than just another minor contribution to his discipline.

The desirable duration of the study period must vary considerably. For a psychologist who is reasonably familiar with the statistical methods of psychology, and who wants to extend that knowledge to include the statistics commonly used by sociologists, a relatively short period of time (perhaps one month) should be adequate. In fact, he may be able to acquire the necessary knowledge through attendance at an appropriate workshop or institute of one or two weeks' duration. For a linguist who has little knowledge of any sort of statistics, a considerably longer period of time would be required (perhaps as much as a year). Thus, a programme designed to foster cross-disciplinary interchange of technical knowledge through study periods, should be flexible on the matter of time. It should accommodate timespans ranging from attendance at interdisciplinary conferences of two to five days' duration, through short institutes and workshops of a week or two, to extended apprenticeships of one to twelve months in research programmes of other scholars.

Whether such a programme could be fitted into the current programmes of the Canada Council, or would require special consideration, is a critical question. Since the Council does have a set of priorities for awarding travel grants to conferences of various sorts it would seem that the short term measures being proposed (conferences, institutes and workshops) could be funded simply by extending the eligibility for conference travel grants, to applicants who wish to extend their knowledge about another discipline, with the intent of broadening their research in the area of the I.L. & S. The more lengthy apprenticeships pose a special problem. One possibility is the leave or research fellowship programme, provided that the area of the I.L. & S.

could be included as a separate entity, as are the recognized social science disciplines, with its own fellowship review committee. Alternatively, it might be possible to allocate points in the regular competition to candidates who are proposing to prepare themselves for cross-disciplinary work in I. L. & S. A simpler method, which would have application beyond the area of the I. L. & S., would involve the Council's acceptance of Canadian problems as a separate concern, after the fashion of the Canadian Journal of Political Science and establishing a programme which would be responsive to the variety of demands which we foresee.

At the moment, there is no single programme which could be responsive to all of the demands. Whether or not it is in the context of a separate programme of Canadian studies, the most desirable solution would appear to be the establishment, by the Canada Council of a separate programme designed to foster the development of interdisciplinary scholars. While our concern is scholars in the area of the individual, language and society, such a programme might well have a broader focus and be open to scholars in Canadian Studies (or, indeed in all areas) in which interdisciplinary development is considered to be desirable.

Research-Granting Procedures

I.L. & S. research receives very modest support in spite of its theoretical and practical importance (see Table V). With I.L. & S. studies, as with any research enterprise, the availability of financial support is vital and the procedures followed in making awards is especially important when granting agencies are on tight budgets. There are a number of aspects of the granting procedures of agencies like the Canada Council which have significance for fostering I.L. & S. research.

Most of the concern appears to arise from the so-called international scholarship issue to which reference has been made. Research that springs from problems in Canada is treated, in the current granting system, in the same way as research that could be done equally well in Kansas or California or Liverpool. In fact, not only does the granting system fail to dis-

'criminate on the basis of the national origin of the research question, but it provides very few incentives for even doing the research in Canada. To this must be added the high percentage of foreign-born and foreign-trained scholars in the disciplines centrally involved in I.L. & S. research, and the referee system of grant application assessment. Referees are chosen from the "international scholarly community", and very few members of that constituency are working on the Canadian problems with which we are concerned. They may be doing inspired work on similar problems with the Puerto Ricans or the Hopi but they are not necessarily directly familiar with the Canadian scene. Given this context, it is not difficult to understand why proportionately so little I.L. & S. research is being done in Canada.

Granting agencies could further assist the research enterprise by serving, as an information clearing centre. More frequently than in other areas of interest, I.L. & S. investigators are interested in the same problem area with the same type of subjects, but from different perspectives. It is not unusual for linguists, psychologists and sociologists to be interested in different and non-conflicting aspects of the functioning of the same subject populations. As was pointed out earlier, the publication patterns of this area militate against their being aware of each other's research interests. When this occurs, the granting agencies could perform a useful function by informing grant applicants of the parallel research which is being proposed, with the suggestion that collaboration might be worthwhile. If the prospective researchers express interest in collaboration, granting agencies could expedite the process by providing support for planning meetings of the investigators themselves, perhaps with the help of others who could be expected to be capable of providing sound advice on how collaboration could be facilitated. This procedure would make it possible to collect two or more sets of data simultaneously with less disruption of subjects, more economy

and greater likelihood of scientific gain.

Initially, there may be some resistance stemming from discipline loyalties. However, our experience, during the Symposium on the Individual, Language and Society, and in the Consultative Group, itself, suggests that, with face-to-face contact in the context of problem-oriented discussion, this sort of resistance will fade into the background.

Obviously the efforts of granting agencies in encouraging collaboration must avoid any suggestion of pressuring investigators to collaborate. To ensure that they are on firm ground in making the suggestion, agencies, when faced with two or more applications which appear to propose duplication of field work, should ask external assessors to judge whether the duplication is warranted or the projects could be coordinated without detriment to either project.

Collaboration is desirable for other research as well. It is one important way of reducing over-exposure of certain populations to researchers, with consequent resistance to participating in future research.

In the area of "Native peoples" studies especially, care must be taken to protect the rights and prerogatives of the subjects. A few groups run the risk of being over-studied and the serious investigator runs the risk of finding the doors closed to him because others have abused their access to the population concerned. All studies, even though conducted most responsibly, may contribute to the development of negative views on the part of the subject population. It follows then, that only studies which offer a reasonable prospect of providing important data be supported. It follows also, that investigators should include in their proposals, procedures for reducing the chances of engendering negative feelings in the subject populations. Often an agreement (perhaps in the form of a contract) between the investigator and his subjects, specifying the responsibilities of, and rewards to, both parties to the

agreement, is a desirable way of keeping negative feelings to a minimum. Granting agencies, for their part, should be assured, before awarding a grant, that the subject population has given, or will give, informed consent to participate in the study.

In the same vein, if a particular group of subjects has been over-studied and another group will serve as well, investigators could be informed that they might be better advised to study that other group. Such a coordinating function cannot adequately be fulfilled by a single granting agency in the ordinary exercise of its functions, since, particularly with studies of native people, funds come from a variety of sources. An agency like Canada Council might undertake the function, over and above its granting activities, or it might designate a group, such as the new interdisciplinary association proposed earlier in this report, to undertake the job.

Canadian Universities and the Individual, Language and Society

The development of strong I.L. & S. research programmes, depends, in the long run, on the preparation of students in our Canadian universities' undergraduate and graduate programmes. At the moment these are seriously weak in several ways.

As would be expected, because there are so few strong interdisciplinary programmes in Canadian universities, there are relatively weak offerings, in most universities, of courses in sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics and psycholinguistics. Single courses at the undergraduate level are offered in many universities across the country. However, we know of no university which offers courses in all of these areas or offers a coordinated multi-disciplinary programme. This situation is worse at the graduate level. The 22 deans of Canadian graduate schools who responded to our requests for information listed only 22 theses, which had been initiated in their universities during the 2 years from 1972-1974.

which were related (even peripherally) to the I.L. & S. domain. (See Appendix E).

Another area of weakness is in what is being taught. Especially at the undergraduate level, the offerings are overwhelmingly foreign-oriented. Almost all the texts in anglophone universities are by American authors, the best of whom refer to the Canadian scene only in passing. The situation is less serious in Francophone universities because the language barrier protects them to some extent from the entrepreneurs of the American publishing houses. An extension of the textbook problem in anglophone universities stems from the fact that a large proportion of the teachers are foreign-trained and thus, by-and-large, oriented toward the use of non-Canadian data. In addition, Canadian students seldom have the opportunity of hearing Canadian I.L. & S. scholars unless those scholars happen to be in their own universities. The Canadian scholars are much more frequently invited to describe their research to American than to Canadian universities. At least two reasons have been offered in explanation of this state of affairs: it is American foundations that make funds available for such visits; and some multi-disciplinary courses in American universities include budgets for visiting lecturers, invited for one or two lectures, by the professors responsible for the courses. Canadian universities, because of the American textbooks and the American-trained professors, unusually invite Americans. And finally, even today many of our best Canadian students are encouraged to study in foreign universities, thus tending to perpetuate the non-Canadian orientation of teaching and research in this area.

There are a number of measures which could increase both the quantity and the quality of the teaching of I.L. & S. studies in Canada. Universities should be encouraged to include I.L. & S. courses in their curricula, particularly in the context of coordinated multidisciplinary programmes.

Those who are developing the Canadian Studies programmes at a number of

Canadian universities, should be made aware of the fact that I.L. & S. courses are an intellectual necessity for any systematic programme in Canadian Studies.

The matter of the teaching material used in universities is open to more direct action. At the present time it is difficult, even for professors who are interested, to locate relevant Canadian I.L. & S. literature. As has been pointed out earlier, the Canadian literature is spread widely through a number of disciplines and specialty journals, most of which are not published in Canada. Those materials which do exist need to be brought together into readily accessible form, and new materials need to be developed. With modest financial assistance, Canadian scholars and publishers could be induced to put together books of readings of Canadian scientific literature; with somewhat more effort the preparation of textbooks could be accomplished. With the establishment of a Canadian specialty journal (as was proposed earlier), professors would have readier access to what was going on on the frontiers of Canadian research and could use materials from the journal both in their lectures and as prescribed reading for their students. They could also identify more easily who is working in areas of research relevant to their teaching needs and invite them for colloquia and guest lectures. A related measure which is badly needed, is the production and circulation of bibliographies of the literature which now exists.

As an additional measure for increasing the ready-availability of Canadian materials, the Canada Council (and other interested granting agencies) could finance specialty conferences of the sort organized in the fall of 1975 by the C.G.I.L. & S. By making the provision of funds contingent on publishing the papers presented at the Conference, in readily available form, the granting agencies would be making a substantial contribution to the teaching of Canadian materials.

The need for more East-West scholarly visiting could be accomplished by relaxing the financial restraints on such travel which now exists in the

priorities of the few granting agencies which might be concerned. Canada Council, which is the agency most centrally concerned, could help substantially by earmarking a portion of its travel budget for inter-university visits. Some lectures might qualify for support from the multi-culturalism programme of the Secretary of State, and interested universities should investigate this programme. To increase the impact of the programme, the host university should assume responsibility for informing other universities in the area being visited, of the time of the visits. For very little extra cost, faculty and students at a number of universities could thus be exposed to the visitor.

The present fellowship system, which places few, if any, impediments in the way of graduate study abroad, needs to be carefully assessed. In the long term it is obvious that some graduate study in other countries is necessary to avoid parochialism. Canadians must also be knowledgeable about what has been done abroad. However, at the present time, this is certainly not a problem, considering that such large numbers of our university faculty members are foreign-trained. With this fact in mind, we suggest that Canadian students be encouraged financially, to attend Canadian graduate schools to pursue study of the Canadian topics with which we are concerned. One way of accomplishing this would be through according the area of the I.L. & S. the status of a discipline in the doctoral fellowship competition. Other granting agencies should modify their procedures to achieve the same ends.

Canadian Government Departments and The Individual, Language and Society

A number of Canadian government departments and agencies sponsor a variety of projects concerned with the I.L. & S. (see Appendix F). Usually these studies are conducted by the government departments to meet a specific

set of departmental objectives, without reference to other groups in society.

There appear to us to be at least two serious weaknesses to this approach.

The most obvious weakness is that the research at the proposal stage is not routinely vetted by external appraisers, who might be expected to detect inadequacies in the studies which were missed by the departmental investigators. Very little research is conducted in Canadian universities which does not go through the peer-review system and it would seem that government departments might see merit in developing within their own organizations, a system similar to that imposed on universities by granting bodies. An important component of such a system is, of course, awareness of the existence of appropriate assessors. The development of a list of assessors and their areas of competence takes years, often with much duplication of the efforts of other agencies and scientific journals interested in similar problem areas. Government departments, interested in using a peer-review system, would be helped substantially if they had access to a central bank of assessors' names and fields of competence, drawn from the existing lists of granting agencies and journals. Indeed, the granting agencies and journals, themselves, might well find such an expanded list helpful in the conduct of their own assessment procedures.

A further difficulty with the government's "in-house" system, is that it ordinarily offers little opportunity for collaborative sharing of subject populations, of the sort which was mentioned in connection with research-granting procedures. This is especially important with respect to large-scale surveys (although it is also relevant to a lesser extent with other types of studies). Such surveys are extremely expensive and therefore the number of them which can be conducted is severely limited. Often it is a relatively simple matter to add questions which in no way interfere with the original intent of the survey and yet add very little if anything to the cost.

Getting two or more large-scale surveys done for the price of one, should appeal to a country like Canada, which has more than the usual need for information and less than the usual amount of money available for acquiring that information. It would seem that, by informing the interested university scholars of proposed large-scale research projects, government departments could enhance the returns to be reaped from their major studies. The I.L. & S. journal, which was proposed earlier, could be an excellent medium for transmitting this information.

REFERENCES

- Berry, J.W.; Kallin, R.; and Taylor, D.M. Multi-culturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada. In press, 1977.
- Coons, W.H.; Taylor, D.M.; and Tremblay, Marc-Adelard. The Individual, Language and Society in Canada. Ottawa: Canada Council, 1977.
- Desrochers, A.M.; Smythe, P.C.; and Gardner, R.C. The Social Psychology of Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism: An Annotated Bibliography. London, Ontario: Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario.
- O'Brien, K.G.; Reitz, J.G.; and Kuprowska, O. Non-official Languages: A Study in Multi-culturalism. Ottawa: Minister responsible for Multi-culturalism.
- Vallee, F.G. and de Vries, J. Data Book for Conference on the Individual, Language and Society. Ottawa: Canada Council, 1975.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire to Scholars

CANADA COUNCIL
Development Section

Consultative Committee on
the Individual, Language and Society

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Name:

Position:

Address:

Discipline:

1. What are you currently doing in the areas subsumed by the Committee's terms-of-reference? (Include research projects, thesis direction, committees, etc.)

2. What have you done in the past 10 years in these areas? (Include publications, and unpublished reports as well as the type of information included in I above. Your curriculum vitae might be helpful)

(Overleaf, are two further questions. If you have time, we would be very interested in your response to them.)

CONSEIL DES ARTS
Section du développement

Groupe consultatif pour l'individu,
le langage et la société

DEMANDE DE RENSEIGNEMENTS

Nom:

Poste:

Adresse:

Discipline:

1. Que faites-vous actuellement dans les domaines compris dans le mandat du groupe? (Mentionnez les travaux de recherche, les directions de thèse, les comités, etc.).

2. Quels travaux avez-vous réalisés dans ces domaines au cours de la dernière décennie? (Publications, rapports inédits et travaux mentionnés à la première question. Votre curriculum vitae pourrait être utile).

(Il y a deux autres questions au verso. Si vous avez le temps d'y répondre, nous vous en serions vivement obligés).

APPENDIX B

Researchers in Individual, Language and Society Study

RESEARCHERS IN THE FIELD

Aboud, F.E.	Lamy, P.
Bain, B.C.	Lapointe, J.
Beauchemin, N.	Laponce, J.A.
Bernier, B.	Laporte, P.E.
Bégin, Yves	Lee, D.J.
Berry, J.W.	Leon, M.
Black, M.B.	MacArthur, R.
Blue, A.W.	MacNamara, J.
Boudreault, M.	Mackey, W.F.
Bowd, A.D.	McCormack, P.D.
Briggs, J.	McCormack, W.C.
Castonguay, C.	Metayer, R.P.
Cartwright, D.G.	Mills, G.
Cazabon, G.	Monod, M.J.
Cedergren, H.J.	Mougeon, R.S.
Coons, W.H.	Neufeld, G.
D'Anglejan, A.	Paillet, J.P.
Danziger, J.	Pitts, R.A.
Darbelnet, J.	Pupier, P.
Darnell, R.	Reitz, J.G.
Denny, P.	Reynolds, A.G.
DeVries, J.	Richer, S.
Dorais, J.-L.	Rona, J.P.
Driedger, L.	Rudnyckyj, J.
Dulla, S.	Saint-Jacques, B.
Elkin, F.	Saint-Pierre, M.
Frideres, J.S.	Salisbury, R.F.
Gannon, R.E.	Samarin, W.J.
Gardner, R.C.	Sankoff, G.
Gendron, J.D.	Santerre, L.
Genesee, F.	Santerre, R.
Gekoski, W.L.	Schneiderman, E.
Gleason, T.P.	Segalowitz, N.
Gulutsan, M.	Skanes, G.R.
Halpern, G.	Smyth, F.E.
Jackson, J.D.	Smythe, P.C.
Jackson, M.	Stern, H.
Jones, C.S.	Swain, M.
Jones, P.A.	Taylor, D.
Joy, R.J.	Taylor, L.J.
Kanungo	Thorburn, H.
Kay, M.L.	Tremblay, M.A.
Kinloch, A.M.	Tucker, G.R.
Kolers, P.A.	Tunstall
Laberge, S.	Vallee, F.G.
Lambert, W.E.	Vanek, A.
Lamontagne, P.L.	Vikis-Freibergs, S.
	Waddell
	Westley, W.A.

APPENDIX C

Delegates to the Conference on the
Individual, Language and Society

CONFERENCE ON THE
INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY

CONSULTATIVE GROUP

Wesley H. Coons (Chairman)
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Arts
York University
4700 Keele Street
DOWNSVIEW, Ontario
M3J 1P3

Jean Briggs
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Memorial University
ST. JOHN'S, Newfoundland
A1C 5S7

Donald Taylor
Department of Psychology
McGill University
P.O. Box 6070
Station "A"
MONTREAL, Quebec
H3C 3G1

Russell MacArthur
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Alberta
EDMONTON, Alberta
T6G 2E1

William F. Mackey
Executive Director
Centre International de la
Recherche sur le Bilinguisme
Université Laval
STE-FOY, Québec
G1K 7P4

Marc-Adélard Tremblay
Directeur de l'Ecole des Gradués
Université Laval
835, avenue Nouvelle-Orléans
STE-FOY, Québec
G1X 3J4

Frank G. Vallee
Department of Sociology
Carleton University
Colonel By Drive
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1S 5B6

SPEAKERS AND DISCUSSANTS

John De Vries
Department of Sociology
Carleton University
Colonel By Drive
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1S 5B6

Norman Segalowitz
Department of Psychology
Concordia University
Sir George Williams Campus
1455 de Maisonneuve Boulevard
MONTREAL, Québec
H3G 1M8

Jean Darbelnet
Département de Linguistique
Université Laval
STE-FOY, Québec
G1K 7P4

Gillian Sankoff
Département d'Anthropologie
Université de Montréal
Casier postal 6128
MONTREAL, Québec
H3C 3J7

Pierre Laporte
Directeur de Recherche
Régie de la Langue Française
Tour de la Bourse
15ième étage
Casier postal 316
MONTREAL, Québec
H4Z 1G8

Leo Driedger
Department of Sociology
University of Manitoba
WINNIPEG, Manitoba
R3T 2N2

John Jackson
Department of Sociology
Concordia University
Sir George Williams Campus
1455 de Maisonneuve Boulevard
MONTREAL, Quebec
H3G 1M8

Raymond Breton
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto
TORONTO, Ontario
M5S 1A1

Gerald Neufeld
Department of Linguistics
and Modern Languages
University of Ottawa
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1N 6N5

Pierre E. Coulombe
Directeur
Division de la Politique
et de la Planification
Conseil du Trésor
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1A 0R5

Bernard Saint-Jacques
Department of Linguistics
University of British Columbia
VANCOUVER, British Columbia
V6T 1W5

William J. Samarin
Department of Linguistics
University of Toronto
TORONTO, Ontario
M5S 1A1

Frances Aboud
Department of Psychology
McGill University
P.O. Box 6070
Station "A"
MONTREAL, Quebec
H3C 3G1

Robert C. Gardner
Co-Director
Language Research Group
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
LONDON, Ontario
N6A 3K7

Merrill Swain
Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
TORONTO, Ontario
M5S 1V6

J. Rudnyckyj
Department of Slavic Studies
University of Manitoba
WINNIPEG, Manitoba
R3T 2N2

John Meisel
Department of Political Science
Queen's University
KINGSTON, Ontario
K7L 3N6

Pauline A. Jones
Director
Institute for Research
in Human Abilities
Memorial University
ST. JOHN'S, Newfoundland
A1C 5S7

M. Gulutsan
Department of Education Psychology
University of Alberta
EDMONTON, Alberta
T6G 2E1

Regna Darnell
Department of Anthropology
University of Alberta
EDMONTON, Alberta
T6G 2E1

John Berry
Department of Psychology
Queen's University
KINGSTON, Ontario
K7L 3N6

Madame Henrietta Cedergren
Département de Linguistique
Université du Québec à Montréal
Caser postal 8888
MONTREAL, Québec
H3C 3P8

Charles W. Hobart
Department of Sociology
University of Alberta
EDMONTON, Alberta
T6G 2E1

DELEGATES

Wallace Lambert
Department of Psychology
McGill University
P.O. Box 6070
Station "A"
MONTREAL, Quebec
H3C 3G1

Neil Morrison
10 Monkland Street
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1S 1Y9

Gerald Halpern
Secretary of State
66 Slater Street - 1903
Lord Elgin Plaza
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1P 5H1

Jane Dobell, Director
Language Programmes Branch
Secretary of State
66 Slater Street - 1900A
Lord Elgin Plaza
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1P 5H1

R.J. Baker, President
University of Prince Edward Island
CHARLOTTETOWN, Prince Edward Island
C1A 4P3

Anne Good
Secretary of State
66 Slater Street
Lord Elgin Plaza
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1P 5H1

APPENDIX D

Format for the National Planning Symposium
on the Individual, Language and Society

REVISED FORMAT FOR CONFERENCE

Delegates to arrive Friday (28 Nov.) with an orientation address and a social hour scheduled for the evening.

Commencing on Day 1, the morning will start off with a 10 minute session during which the speaker for Theme No. 1 talks to his paper. Following him will be the two discussants who will talk for 5 minutes to their papers and then the three of them will engage in a free discussion for perhaps 30 minutes. The group will then break into smaller sessions (perhaps 4 groups of 8-9) and each of these will discuss the formal presentations and formulate propositions, until 11:30. At 11:30, the larger group will reconvene in plenary session for an hour during which the chairmen of the small groups will summarize the group's comments and proposals, the Speaker and Discussants will be given time to comment, followed by discussion from the floor. The focus of this session will be to provide consensual validation of views put forward during the morning sessions and, conversely, to put idiosyncratic views in perspective.

It may be possible to put issues in the form of propositions on which delegates could express their views. This would seem practicable with assessment of areas in which research is needed, and for means of facilitating research. Certainly, whenever it is feasible to express issues in the form of relatively precise propositions, it should be done so that the Editor and the Consultative Committee have an unambiguous expression of the sentiments of the Conference. Propositions could be put before the delegates in plenary sessions throughout the week.

The same format will be followed in the afternoon for Theme No. 2 with perhaps 2-3 members of each group being shifted to other groups to facilitate the development of hybrid vigour. In the evening, a Commentator will give an overview of what he saw as the main points, the problems and the proposals covered during the day. (The Commentator could be a wise man who comments on all the themes or there could be several Commentators chosen because of special knowledge about particular themes, e.g., members of the Consultative Committee). This would be followed by plenary session discussion until about 9:30 P.M.

A great deal of attention must be given to recording discussion. All formal papers will be available to the Editor of the Conference Report (he should be appointed well in advance so that he can organize the reporting system he requires) but the recording and summarizing of both the small group and the plenary session discussion will be complicated. Tape-recorders, and "person-recorders" will be necessary, as will abundant secretarial assistance. The latter point is especially important since quick feedback will be necessary during the Conference.

The chairman of the plenary sessions and of each small group will retain those positions throughout the Conference. Each group should have a recorder (Council Officers?) who will be responsible for collecting all the documents originating from within his group and for providing the Editor with copies and summaries of discussions (including criticisms as well as recommendations). The Editor may wish to appoint a Managing Editor to ride herd on all Chairmen to make sure that they are collecting

the needed material and another editor to keep track of action proposals made throughout the Conference.

A Steering Committee, drawn from the Consultative Committee but with power to coopt non-committee persons as needed, should be appointed at once. The Steering Committee would be responsible for planning and organizing the Conference and would be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Conference once it was underway. The Editor of the Conference Report should be a member of the Steering Committee.

29 July 1975

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

CONFERENCE ON THE INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY

28 November - 2 December 1975

November 28th

- 8:00 p.m. Orientation
9:00 p.m. Social hour

November 29th

- 9:00 a.m. Language Contact in Canada
Chairman: Frank Vallee
Speaker: John de Vries
Discussants: Henrietta Cedergren and Jean Darbelnet
10:00 Coffee
10:30 Small-group discussions
11:30 Plenary session
Summaries of small group discussions
Comments from the floor
12:30 Lunch
2:00 p.m. The Social & Behavioural Implications of Bilingualism
in Canada
Chairman: Robert Gardner
Speaker: Norman Segalowitz
Discussants: Bernard Saint-Jacques and Gillian Sankoff
3:00 Coffee
3:30 Small-group discussions
4:30 Plenary Session
6:00 Dinner
7:30 Overview and general discussion

November 30th

- 9:00 a.m. Individual, Social and Structural Factors in Language
Maintenance & Restoration in Canada
Chairman: Jean Briggs
Speaker: Leo Driedger
Discussants: Pierre Laporte and William Samarin
10:00 Coffee
10:30 Small-group discussions
11:30 Plenary session
12:30 Lunch

2:00 p.m. Functions of Languages in Canada
Chairman: Frank Vallee
Speaker: John Jackson
Discussants: Frances Aboud & Raymond Breton
3:00 Coffee
3:30 Small-group discussions
4:30 Plenary session
6:00 Dinner
7:30 Overview & general discussion

December 1st

9:00 Social Factors in Language Acquisition & Bilingualism in Canada
Chairman: Russell MacArthur
Speaker: Robert Gardner
Discussants: Gerald Neufeld & Merrill Swain
10:00 Coffee
10:30 Small-group discussions
11:30 Plenary session
12:30 Lunch
2:00 Varieties of Institutional & Individual Bilingualism in Canada
Chairman: William Mackey
Speaker: Pierre-E. Coulombe
Discussants: John Meisel & Jaroslav Rudnyckyj
3:00 Coffee
3:30 Small-group discussions
4:30 Plenary session
6:00 Dinner
7:30 Overview & general discussion

December 2nd

9:00 Language, Culture & Cognition in Canada
Chairman: Russell MacArthur
Speaker: John Berry
Discussants: Metro Culatson & Pauline Jones
10:00 Coffee
10:30 Small-group discussions
11:30 Plenary session
12:30 Lunch

2:00 Language Planning in Canada - Politics and Practices
Chairman: William Mackey
Speaker: Charles Hobart
Discussants: Jean-Claude Corbeil and Regna Darnell
3:00 Coffee
3:30 Small-group discussions
4:30 Plenary session
6:00 Dinner

APPENDIX E

Graduate Studies in the Domain of the
Individual, Language and Society

GRADUATE STUDIES IN THE DOMAIN
OF THE INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND
SOCIETY

In May 1974, letters were sent to the Deans of Graduate Studies at 40 universities in Canada asking them to furnish lists of theses underway in disciplines which might be concerned with the individual, language and society. Responses were received from 22 universities.

Alberta	Simon Fraser
Montreal	Saskatchewan
Toronto	Victoria
Manitoba	Laval
Dalhousie	Trent
UQAM	Memorial
Waterloo	McGill
UBC	Ottawa

Universities which indicated that no theses in this field were being prepared:

Queen's	Nova Scotia Technical
ENAP	College
Saint Mary's	Wilfrid Laurier
Brock	

22 theses were undertaken since 1972, which fell within the Consultative Group's terms-of-reference:

University	Department	Student's Name	Title
Alberta	Anthropology	Lydia Emmanuel	Ukrainian parish language loyalty
Toronto	Educational Theory	Maria-Elena Valdes	The sociolinguistic context in the teaching of second language
Toronto	Educational Theory	Angelina Theresa Fong	An experiment in role-playing by adults learning a second language
Toronto	Educational Theory	Suzanne Matto	The motivation of adult immigrants for learning English as a second language

University	Department	Student's name	Title
Toronto	Sociology	C. Cunco	Social Class, language and the national question in Canada: an analysis of the social support for the integration of Canada with the United States
Simon Fraser	Modern Languages	J.-G. Trépanier	Social cultural aspects of language variation in Québec
Saskatchewan	Educational psychology	Sonia V. Cipywnyk	Educational implications of Ukrainian-English bilingualism in Saskatchewan
Laval	Linguistique	G. McDonnell	Le sociolinguistique
Ottawa	Linguistics & Modern Languages	L.-P. Vaillancourt	Relations entre la langue et la culture des indiens cris québécois
Ottawa	Psychology	Virginia Carver	Second Language Acquisition and cognition
Ottawa	Psychology	Lise Chislett	Résolution de problèmes et bilinguisme
Ottawa	Psychology	Daniel Crocco	Compound-coordinate bilinguals semantic differences of concrete abstract words, the orienting reflex and verbal transformation effect
Ottawa	Psychology	Cameron Egyed	Effects of Italian-English bilingual kindergarten on achievement of immigrant children
Ottawa	Psychology	Marie-Claire Maneckjee	Etude de la relation entre la personnalité de l'enfant et son niveau de performance linguistique dans l'acquisition d'une deuxième langue
Ottawa	Psychology	Ruth Tremaine	Syntactic and cognitive development in English-speaking children learning French in primary school

University	Department	Student's name	Title
Ottawa	Linguistics & Modern language	E. Irving-Szabo	A psycholinguistic study of the influence of second language acquisition upon performance in the first language: a comparison of monolingual and bilingual francophone
Memorial	Linguistics	E.M. Glenn Loveless	Interference of first language verbal system on second language learning
Memorial	Linguistics	Carol A. Fitzgerald	Categories of second language interference
McGill	Psychology	Lise Simard	Motivation for second-language learning and its role in cross-cultural communication
McGill	Psychology	Margaret E. Bruck	The influence of kindergarten experience on the language acquisition of children from different socio-economic backgrounds
McGill	Linguistics	Elizabeth Segalowitz	Variability and its social consequences in the pronunciation of English by French speakers
McGill	Linguistics	Hanny Feurer	The sociolinguistics of question-answer constructions in Mohawk: a comparison of conversational and classroom usage

APPENDIX F

Research on the Individual, Language and Society
Supported by Canadian Government Departments and Agencies

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF MAN

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Termination Date</u>	<u>Total Contract \$</u>	<u>Division</u>
MORGAN, L.	Undertake an Urgent Ethnology project on an Ethnolinguistic study of the Kutenai language in various places in B.C.	15-5-74	1-2-75	3,000.00	Ethnology
BLUMSTOCK, R.	Carry out an intensive field research on social types in a Hungarian-Canadian rural community in Saskatchewan.	1-7-74	1-2-75	800.00	CCFCS
BONVILLAIN, N.	Conduct linguistics research on the influence of French dialects of Mohawk at Caughnawaga and St. Regis Reserves.	1-7-74	1-2-75	625.00	Ethnology
BRIGGS, J.L.	Undertake a study of Eskimo ethnopsychology and emotional expression in Cumberland Sound.	1-4-75	1-2-76	3,250.00	Ethnology
YANG, C.	Carry out research on the Chinese community and culture in Montreal, especially on conceptual framework, community institutions and ecology of Chinatown.	1-7-75	15-12-75	4,000.00	CCFCS
BREYER, L.	Initiate field investigations among German Canadians in the Delhi Area.	1-6-73	31-3-75	700.00	CCFCS
CHIN, R.	Research the Chinese community and folk culture in Montreal, especially cultural values and identities.	1-7-75	15-12-75	4,000.00	CCFCS
WHALLEY, Rosalind	Collect linguistic and ethnolinguistic data from the Gitksan Indian people in the Hazelton, B.C. area for a dictionary of Gitksan language and to submit a field report and tapes.	15-10-75	29-2-76	1,775.00	Ethnology

Projets de recherche et organismes subventionnés
par le Secrétariat d'Etat dans le but de promouvoir
le bilinguisme

- 1- Le Service d'admissions aux collèges et universités (SACU) a reçu une subvention de \$147,000. pour élaborer des tests de connaissance du français et de l'anglais (testing).
- 2- Gerald Neufeld de l'Université d'Ottawa a reçu une subvention de \$13,380. pour un projet de recherche sur la fixation de l'image acoustique dans l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde (linguistique).
- 3- H.H. Stern de l'O.I.S.E. a reçu une subvention de \$39,530. pour poursuivre une étude intitulée The Good language Learner. Aider les étudiants qui ont des problèmes d'apprentissage en connaissant mieux les stratégies d'apprentissage du "bon étudiant" (psycholinguistique).
- 4- Madame Maria Oryschuk a reçu une subvention de \$9,531. pour préparer un manuel de français à l'usage des Ukrainiens (didactique).
- 5- Agatha Sidlauskas de l'Université d'Ottawa a reçu deux subventions pour un total de \$68,554. pour son projet sur l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde chez des enfants en milieu bilingue. (Modèle d'immersion double).
- 6- Les professeurs R. Lamérand et E. Levenston de O.I.S.E. ont reçu une subvention de \$35,040. pour leur étude intitulée "English as a Second Language for French-speaking Children". L'étude a porté sur la phonologie, la grammaire et le vocabulaire.
- 7- Le Collège Universitaire Saint-Jean de l'Université de l'Alberta recevra probablement sous peu une dernière subvention pour compléter une étude interdisciplinaire sur l'enseignement bilingue dispensé aux franco-albertains. Les deux subventions accordées à ce jour totalisent \$114,860.
- 8- Un groupe de chercheurs dirigés par P. Smythe et R. Gardner (University of Western Ontario) a reçu sur une période de trois ans des subventions de \$375,000. afin d'analyser les facteurs d'attitude et de motivation dans l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde. Ils ont élaboré des tests qui permettent de mesurer ces facteurs et de prédire le succès des sujets en fonction des résultats de ces tests. (psycholinguistique-testing).

- 9- Le professeur Claude Rochette de l'Université Laval a reçu trois subventions totalisant \$360,300. pour une recherche en phonétique combinatoire et comparée du français et de l'anglais (linguistique-phonétique).
- 10- L'Institut national de recherche scientifique (I.N.R.S.) a reçu une subvention de \$43,800. pour un projet d'individualisation de l'anglais langue seconde à l'élémentaire (didactique).
- 11- Fred Genesee de l'Université McGill a reçu une subvention de \$5,310. pour poursuivre l'étude d'un groupe d'élèves anglophones de Montréal qui reçoivent leur enseignement en français et en hébreu au niveau élémentaire.
- 12- Le Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme (C.I.R.B.) a reçu une subvention annuelle de soutien depuis 1972-1973. Le total des subventions à ce jour totalise \$494,110.
- 13- La Banque de terminologie de l'Université de Montréal a pour sa part reçu \$350,000. en subventions de soutien réparties sur quatre ans.
- 14- En plus des subventions à divers projets de recherches et aux organismes mentionnés aux nos. 12 et 13, le Secrétariat d'Etat subventionne la publication des cahiers "Travaux de recherches sur le bilinguisme" de O.I.S.E. et quelques numéros spéciaux de la "Revue Canadienne des langues vivantes" (Canadian Modern Language Review).

Michèle Labrecque

List of Publications

Linguistic Research Unit
Research Division
Directorate of Studies
Staff Development Branch
Public Service Commission

August 1974

II. PAPERS PUBLISHED INTERNALLY:

1. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1970)

"Linguistic Analysis of Administrative Writing:
An Interim report on a research study being conducted
in the English Curriculum Section".
Pedagogical Bulletin, Language Bureau, Sept., 1970.

2. CHIU, Rosaline K.; BARKER, Glenn; NEUFELD, Darien; SORIUS, Helen;
(1973)

"Research Highlights"
Pedagogical Bulletin, 1973-2E, Language Bureau.

3. BARKER, Glenn. (1973)

"Two-work Verb Matrix: An Aid to the Teaching of
Oral English", in Neufeld, D. (ed.) Some Characteristics
of Spoken English, Pedagogical Bulletin, 1973-4E,
pp. 2 - 15.

4. SORIUS, Helen B. (1973)

"To Hear Ourselves: Implications for Teachers of
English as a Second Language", in Neufeld, D. (ed.)
Some Characteristics of Spoken English, Pedagogical
Bulletin, 1973-4E. pp. 16 -33.

5. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1973)

"The English Modal Auxiliaries: Frequency and
Usage in Boardroom Discussion", in Neufeld, D. (ed.)
Some Characteristics of Spoken English, Pedagogical
Bulletin, 1973-4E, pp. 34 - 54.

6. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"L'Analyse des Erreurs: Etat actuel de la Recherche".
Forthcoming.

7. CORBET, Frances (1974)

"Error Analysis: What Teachers Can Do".
Forthcoming.

I. ARTICLES PUBLISHED EXTERNALLY:

1. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1971)

"ESL Curriculum Development: The Role of Linguistic Research Projects".

Citizenship Branch, Community Services Division, Ministry of Community and Social Services: Fifth Ontario Conference for Teachers of English as a Second Language at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Feb., 1971, pp. 35 - 36.

2. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1972)

"Measuring Register Characteristics: A Prerequisite for Preparing Advanced Level TESOL Programs"

TESOL Quarterly (A Journal for Teachers of English of Other Languages) Vol. 6, No. 2, June, 1972, pp. 129 - 141.

3. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1973)

"Measuring Register Characteristics"

IRAL (International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching) Vol. XI, No. 1, February, 1973, pp. 51 - 68.

4. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1973)

"Register Constraints on the Choice of the English Verb".

The English Quarterly, (A Publication of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English) Vol. 6, No. 2, Summer, 1973, pp. 123 - 137.

5. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1974)

"The English Modal Auxiliaries: Frequency and Usage in Boardroom Discussion".

Research in the Teaching of English (Official Bulletin of National Council of Teachers of English, U.S.A.) Forthcoming, Winter, 1974.

6. SORIUS, Helen B. (1974)

"To Hear Ourselves: Implications for Teachers of English as a Second Language".

English Language Teaching (Oxford University Press in association with the British Council). Forthcoming.

III PAPERS PRESENTED AT CONFERENCES:

1. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1971)

"ESL Curriculum Development: The Role of Linguistic Research Projects".

Paper presented at the 5th Ontario Conference for Teachers of English as a Second Language, Toronto, Ontario, Feb., 1971.

2. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1971)

"Measuring Register Characteristics: A Prerequisite for Preparing Advanced Level TESOL Programs".

Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, New Orleans, U.S.A., March, 1971.

3. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1971)

"Measuring Register Characteristics".

Paper presented at the 1971 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association, St. John's, Newfoundland, June, 1971.

4. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1972)

"Register Constraints on the Choice of the English Verb".

Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, Washington, D.C. U.S.A., March, 1972.

5. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1973)

"Looking into the Characteristics of Spoken and Written English: A Report on the On-going Applied Linguistic Projects of the Research Division, Directorate of Studies, Staff Development Branch, Public Service Commission of Canada."

Paper presented at the 6th annual Conference of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, Vancouver, British Columbia, August, 1973.

6. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1974)

"Describing the Grammatical - statistical Patterns in Registers: Towards the Making of Pedagogical Grammars".

Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, Denver, Colorado, U.S.A.

IV. PAPERS PRESENTED AT SEMINARS:

1. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"L'Analyse des Erreurs: Etat actuel de la Recherche".
Paper presented at the Seminar organised by the
Research Division, August 7, 1974.

2. CORBET, Frances (1974)

"Error Analysis: What Teachers Can Do".
Paper presented at the Seminar organised by the
Research Division, August 14, 1974.

V. REPORTS:

1. BARKER, Glenn; SORIUS, Helen B. (1972)

"The Importance of Fixed Expressions in Oral Spontaneity".
Language Bureau, PSC, March 1972.

2. CHIU, Rosaline K. (1973)

"Report on Phase I AAC/ASE A Study on Verb Usage in Two Varieties of English: Administrative Correspondence and Boardroom Discussion".
Language Bureau, PSC, April, 1973.

3. NEUFELD, Darien (1974)

"Implementation and Data Processing: The Syntactic Analysis of Spoken English and the Syntactic Analysis of Written English".
Research Division, Directorate of Studies, SDB, PSC, July, 1974.

4. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"Error Analysis: the State of the Art".
Research Division, Directorate of Studies, SDB, PSC, July, 1974.

5. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"Interlanguage: the State of the Art".
Research Division, Directorate of Studies, SDB, PSC, July, 1974.

6. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"Language Development Processes".
Research Division, Directorate of Studies, SDB, PSC, July, 1974.

7. LANGE, Michel (1974)

"Language Learning Strategies".
Research Division, Directorate of Studies, SDB, PSC, July, 1974.

3 1761 11465499 9

